DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 361 IR 001 753

AUTHOR	Schwarzkopf, LeRoy C.
TITLE	Survey of Regional Depository Libraries for U.S. Government Publications.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. School of Library and Information Services.
PUB DATE	Dec 74
NOTE	85p.; For a related document see ED 066 177
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Depository Libraries; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Government Publications; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Collections; Library Cooperation; Library Reference Services; Library Services; *Library Surveys; Microforms; *Regional Libraries; State Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Depository Library Act 1962; Government Printing Office; GPO

ABSTRACT

Based on 33 responses to mailed questionnaires, visits to selected regional depositories, and the author's personal experience as a regional depository librarian, this report analyzes the interpretation and implementation by the Superintendent of Documents, state library agencies, and depository libraries of key provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962. The Act assigned additional responsibilities to regional depositories in the areas of permanent retention of depository publications, assistance to other depositories in discarding documents, interlibrary loan, and reference service. The following related subjects are also discussed: historical background, including experimental regional depositories in Wisconsin and New York in the 1950's; impact of other major changes introduced by the Depository Library Act of 1962 including expansion of the depository system, and distribution of non-Government Printing Office publications; organization of regional depositories as large research libraries for overall government documents service; and federal financial support to the depository library system. (Author)

ED104361

SURVEY
OF
REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES
FOR
U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

by

LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf
Government Documents Librarian
University of Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

College Park, Maryland
December 1974

IR 001 753

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962	3
	Increase in Number of Congressional Designations	3
	Increase in Number of Federal Library Depositories.	7
	Non-GPO Publications	8
III.	WISCONSIN/NEW YORK EXPERIMENT	11
IV.	ORGANIZATION	14
	Designation and Functions of Regional Depositories.	14
	Numbers, Types, and Service Areas	14
	Organization for Documents Service	17
V.	RETENTION POLICY AND MICROFORMS	23
	Bills and Resolutions	23
	GPO Micropublishing Project	26
VI.	DISPOSAL POLICY	28
	General vs. Detailed List	28
	Offerings of Unwanted Publications	29
	Other Disposal Policy	31
VII.	INTERLIBRARY LOAN	33
VIII.	REFERENCE SERVICE	36
	Periodic Visits	36
	Inspections and Standards	37
	Workshops	39
	Other Assistance	39
IX.	FEDERAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT	41
	Legislative History	41
	Recent Developments	42
	Added Costs for Regionals	46
	FOOTNOTES	49

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONNAIRE ON REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

B. INSTRUCTIONS TO DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES, Revised July 1974

APPENDIX

C. REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY SYSTEM

D. TO ALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, 1953

E. TO ALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK, 1956

F. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS TO REGIONAL DEPOSITORIES, 1962

G. REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES WITH DATE OF DESIGNATION

H. REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

I. NUMBER OF DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES AS OF APRIL 1974

J. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 14

K. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 19

L. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 25

M. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 30

N. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 34

O. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 35

P. COMMENTS ON QUESTION 42

I. INTRODUCTION

This report is designed to update my 1972 report, Regional Libraries and the Depository Library Act of 1962.[1] Like the earlier report it is based on an anlaysis of responses to a detailed questionnaire which was sent in spring of 1974 to all designated regional depository libraries. Replies were received from 38 libraries. However, the five libraries which did not respond to this survey had answered my earlier questionnaire, and I incorporated some of the data from the 1972 survey into this report. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) contained 47 items; the 1972 questionnaire contained 49 items. Both questionnaires were organized into six sections covering the following topics: organization, retention policy, disposal policy, interlibrary loan, reference service, and financial support. Many of the same questions appear on both surveys. However, certain questions on the 1972 survey were later deleted or modified, or new questions were added based on response to the earlier survey and to recent developments affecting the depository library system.

This report is also based on an analysis of the library literature on the subject of regional depository libraries, and the depository library system in general. It is also based on my experience as a regional depository librarian since 1967, and on visits made to fourteen other regional depositories from Connecticut to New Mexico.

The main purpose of this report is to describe how the Superintendent of Documents and the regional depositories have interpreted and implemented those provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962 which deal with regional depositories. Like the earlier report, it also provides an analysis and status report of the implementation of other major changes in that landmark legislation.

The earlier report was prepared in 1972 to coincide with the tenth anniversary of the Depository Library Act of 1962. The two years which have elapsed have seen some significant changes in the world of government documents and the depository library scene. Activity by professional library associations has increased tremendously at the national, regional, state, and local levels. The Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) was organized in June 1972 at the American Library Association (ALA) Annual Conference in Chicago. It has greatly expanded the opportunities to participate in activities of concern to the profession, and has attracted a large gathering of concerned documents librarians to the yearly midwinter and annual ALA conferences. It also publishes a newsletter, Documents to the People to keep documents librarians informed about its activities, and about other significant happenings in the world of government documents. The American Association of Law Libraries established a Government Documents Committee in 1974. It conducted a workshop at the 1974 Annual Conference, and has similar plans for the 1975 Conference. The Government Information Services Committee continues as an active group in the Special Libraries Association. A number of government documents workshops have been conducted by regional, state, and local associations.

Meanwhile, significant progress has been made at the Government Printing Office. Most of the operations of the Superintendent of Documents have moved to new and enlarged quarters. The newly designated Library and Statutory Distribution Service which is responsible for cataloging and indexing activities, and for operations of the depository library program has moved to expanded quarters in Alexandria, Virginia. Preparation of the Monthly Catalog was partially automated in early 1974, and it is expected that sometime in 1975 preparation of the Monthly Catalog will be completely automated from input of cataloging data at a computer terminal to composition of final copy by Linotron machine. Automated materials handling equipment is being installed, and other improved facilities, equipment, and techniques are being introduced to improve distribution of publications to depository libraries. The sales publications operation of the Superintendent of Documents has also moved to new and expanded quarters. The office personnel moved to a new office building one block north of the old GPO building on North Capitol Street. A new warehouse for storing sales stock and processing orders has been leased in nearby Laurel, Maryland. The position of the Superintendent of Documents has been upgraded to that of Assistant Public Printer. The Public Documents Department has been reorganized, with responsibilities decentralized and operations streamlined.[2]

During the past two years, the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents have made commendable strides in improving cooperation with the library community. A Depository Library Council to the Public Printer was activated in early 1973 and has been quite active, meeting at least twice a year. The Superintendent of Documents conducted a workshop for regional depository librarians following the 1974 ALA Annual Conference in New York City, and has planned a similar workshop in connection with the 1975 ALA Annual Conference at San Francisco. GPO representatives have also participated in most GODORT meetings, and at many documents workshops throughout the country.

I have again, as a general rule, not identified specific regional depository libraries, or librarians. I have reported gross or average data obtained from the responses to the survey. However, I have enlarged the Appendix by the addition of two types of enclosures. I have included extracts or copies of significant documents which might not be readily available to the reader. I have also included extracts of verbatim comments made by the regional librarians to specific questions. Comments to some questions were so diverse and wide ranging that it was difficult to analyze or categorize them. Many of them are quite perceptive. I did not want them to be wasted. They may provide ideas to other documents librarians. Some of them may be useful to other researchers on this topic, who may find them valuable for analysis or citation.

I should like to thank my fellow regional depository librarians who took time off from their busy schedules to complete the detailed questionnaire, and to add their comments. This report would not have been possible without their willing cooperation. It is hoped that this report will provide them some dividends in improved regional depository library service for the time expended.

II. DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962

Regional depository libraries were officially authorized by the Depository Library Act of 1962, which was approved August 9, 1962.[1] This legislation provided the first major change in depository library law since 1922, when a provision in an appropriation act changed all depositories to selective status.[2] They previously had no choice in their selections, and had to accept all publications distributed by the Superintendent of Documents.

The Depository Library Act of 1962 served to codify earlier separate legislation into a single law. In addition to authorization for regional depositories, it included three other major changes which will be discussed briefly in this chapter:

a. Increased the number of Congressional designations by each Representative and Senator from 1 to 2;[3]

b. Increased the number of depository designations for federal libraries from one for each executive department and each service academy to one for each executive department and independent agency (plus each service academy) and "additional depository libraries within executive departments and independent agencies ... to the extent the number so designated does not exceed the number of major bureaus or divisions of the departments or independent agencies".[4]

c. Authorized the distribution of non-GPO publications within the depository library program.[5] Previously the program had as a practical matter been limited to publications printed by, or under supervision of the Government Printing Office.

Increase in Number of Congressional Designations.

The major change which the promoters of the Depository Library Act of 1962 wished was an increase in the authorized number of congressional designations. The need for additional depositories was claimed to be the most critical problem. This situation occured despite the fact that in 1962 there were 126 existing vacancies of which 117 were congressional designations (104 representative, 12 senatorial, and 1 territorial delegate). The other nine vacancies were for special designations: 8 land grant college libraries, and one state library. However, the vacancies did not exist where the depository designations were desired, or needed. The situation arose from the basic concept of tying most designations to the congressional district.[6]

The number of representatives is limited by law to 435. This theoretically limits the number of representative designations to 870. The law does not authorize an increase in the total number of representatives with increases in the population. After each decennial census which has invariably reported a larger population, the total share of 435 representatives is reapportioned among the states, some gaining representatives and others losing them. Since the law prohibits withdrawal of a depository designation involuntarily without cause, this

redistricting may in actual practice result in the creation of added depositories over the theoretical maximum. Some districts have three or more depositories with representative designations. On the other hand, a previously unused designation may be lost by such redistricting.

Other factors contributing to the problem of unusable vacancies are the disparity in the population among the congressional districts, and in the uneven distribution of educational institutions and other important library resources within the districts.[7] In 1962, population in the districts ranged from a low of 177,431 (12th Michigan district) to a high of 1,014,460 (28th California). However, with the trend toward the "one-man-one-vote" concept and reapportionment and redistricting following the 1970 Census, the range has been narrowed with most districts near the national average of 467,000. The low and high are both small, single district states: Alaska with 302,173 and North Dakota with 617,761 population.

Meanwhile, academic libraries have gained preeminence in the depository library system. Out of a total of 1148 depositories as of April 1974, 745 or 65% of the total are academic libraries. The creation of community colleges has served to spread the location of academic institutions more evenly throughout the states, at least at the first two year level. However, the community colleges do not have research libraries. The university libraries which tend to have extensive documents collections remain concentrated as before. Other research libraries, including public libraries, tend to be concentrated in metropolitan areas.

Despite the increase in the authorized number of congressional designations, the situation is again approaching the critical and paradoxical stage it had in the late 1950's. There are a number of libraries which wish, and deserve to acquire depository status but are unable to due to lack of congressional vacancies in their district and/or state. In 1962, 594 libraries had been designated as depositories out of a possible 720, leaving 126 vacancies. In April 1974 the number of depository libraries had nearly doubled to 1,148 out of a theoretical possibility of 1,390 depositories, leaving 242 vacancies of which 192 are congressional designations (17 senatorial and 175 representative). However, the theoretical maximum is understated, particularly with respect to the current estimate of 125 for "libraries of independent agencies and of major bureaus and divisions of departments and agencies".

The same basic solution has been proposed in the 1970's that was proposed in the late 1950's and adopted in 1962: increase the number of congressional designations. Other solutions have also been proposed: increase the categories of libraries to be granted special designations, and designate libraries on an individual "as needed" basis. During the 92d Congress, five identical bills sponsored by 48 representatives were introduced which would increase the number of designations authorized each congressional district from two to three.[8] Thirty six of the bills' sponsors had used up their representative designations. There were no hearings, and the bills died in committee.

During the 93d Congress, four bills with the same purpose were again introduced.[9] Again no hearings were held, and the bills died in committee.

A secondary method proposed to increase the number of depositories has been special designations on a blanket and/or individual basis. In additon to the special designations for federal libraries mentioned above, special designations have been authorized by law to state libraries from the beginning of the depository library system, and to libraries of land grant colleges since 1907.[10] Special legislation has been used to designate specific individual libraries, two of which retain depository status based on special legislation.[11]

The principal group attempting to gain blanket depository authorization by special designation are the law school libraries. Three bills were introduced in the 92d Congress which would provide special designations to libraries of accredited law schools.[12] No hearings were held, and these bills died in committee. During the 93d Congress, two bills were again introduced for the same purpose[13] and met the same fate. Meanwhile, thirty law school libraries have obtained depository status using congressional designations, all but two of these since 1962. The reason for their wanting depository status is understandable considering the large amount of legal materials which are distributed free to libraries under the depository program. However, in 23 cases the law school depository library is located on the same campus as the main university library which is already a depository, thereby denying the designation to a public library which might be more oriented to serving the public and provide a wider range of materials.

Since my previous report, one category of libraries has been granted special designation authority: state appellate court libraries by Public Law 92-368, approved August 10, 1972.[14] In this case the bill was favorably reported out of committee in both houses without hearings.[15] In a letter to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Public Printer had expressed no objection to this legislation. However, the legislation set a bad precedent in several respects. When the law was passed at least four such libraries were already depositories. One of them had used a state library designation, and three others had used congressional designations. At least a fifth library and probably more are in this category. The Maryland State Library (its official title) which has used the state library designation for Maryland is actually the library of the state appellate court and could qualify instead for the new special designation. The 1974 edition of the Joint Committee on Printing Committee Print on Depository Libraries[16] lists the number of possible designations in this category as 47. It should be at least 51, since the three excepted libraries could vacate their present designations and use the new special designations. Also, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals was granted depository status under this category. As of April 1974, nine libraries of state appellate courts had obtained depository status under this legislation. (i.e. Alaska, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, and Texas)

The law specifically exempts the state appellate court libraries from the provisions of section 1911, Title 44, U.S. Code which directs that "depository libraries shall make Government publications available for the free use of the general public, and may dispose of them after retention for five years under section 1912 of this title, if the depository library is served by a regional depository". This raises the question: what is the purpose of the depository library system? The purpose is presumably stated in section 1911: "to make Government publications available for the free use of the general public". The principle of designation by congressional district is clearly in concert with this purpose. The principle of special designation is not. Indeed, in another portion of the law, federal libraries are exempted from the second part of section 1911 quoted above. They may discard publications at any time, offering them to the Library of Congress or the National Archives.[17] In his implementing Instructions, the Superintendent of Documents declares that "Regional Depository Libraries have no jurisdiction over the depository libraries in the various agencies of the Federal Government within the region they serve".[18] Although federal libraries are presumably bound by section 1911, the legislative history indicates that the main purpose of their special designation is to allow them to conveniently acquire documents of other federal agencies from a central source for their own internal use, rather than for serving the public. Authorizing special designations for land grant college libraries, together with preeminence of the academic library in the depository system leads one to wonder if the program is designed mainly to support higher education, rather than to make government documents available to the people.

During the 93d Congress, the concept of special designations for individual libraries again raised its ugly head. This had been one of the key situations which instigated introduction of legislation that resulted in the Depository Library Act of 1962. Two special bills were introduced to grant depository status to individual libraries: H.R. 11423 on behalf of Freedonia (N.Y.) State University and S.420 on behalf of the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Both died in committee.

One odd incident of the history of the Depository Library Act of 1962 concerns this matter. The need for reform of the depository library system arose from an investigation of "paperwork management" in the federal government authorized by House Resolution 262, 84th Congress. In hearings on the sale and distribution of government publications, it was disclosed that the Superintendent of Documents had recommended disapproval of several bills introduced on behalf of individual libraries by their Congressmen to obtain depository status as an exception since there were no congresional vacancies in their district. The Superintendent of Documents testified that he was not against increasing the number of depositories on a planned basis, but he was opposed to "piecemeal" designation of new depositories which he felt would result in an avalanche of similar requests for exceptions.[19] One such request was introduced on behalf of Kent State University by the chairman of the House subcommittee responsible for depository library legislation.[20] This gave the impetus to introduction of legislation recommending

changes in the depository library system, and the subsequent hearings in both houses. However, it turned out later that although there were no representative vacancies in the district in which Kent State is located, there was still one senatorial vacancy available in Ohio. This was indeed later assigned to Kent State University in 1962, which used it rather than the new representative designation which became available. The new designation was not taken until 1971.

A somewhat similar solution of special designation based on individual need has been proposed by the ALA Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System. The committee recommended the establishment of a National Depository Library, which among other responsibilities would be authorized to approve requests for additional depositories on a piecemeal basis "as needed" subject to prior approval of the state library agency and the regional depository serving the area. However, this recommendation cannot be accepted as ALA policy since the report of the Committee which included this recommendation was approved by ALA Council at the Annual Conference at New York in July 1974 subject to the added recommendations of the ALA Legislative Committee that a detailed study should be made of the existing depository library system "to substantiate the need for change".[21] No such detailed study was made by the Ad Hoc Committee before submitting its report. Congress is also reluctant to make major changes in the depository system without a detailed study. However, a welcome development is a move by the Joint Committee on Printing which may give it the capacity to make such studies. It has obtained appropriations to establish three new spaces "to review the statutes and documents distribution program of the Government Printing Office".[22]

Increase in the Number of Federal Library Depositories

Prior to 1962 special designations had been authorized for the four service academies, and for the libraries of the ten executive departments. The Depository Library Act of 1962 authorized special designations for the library of each independent agency, and "additional depository libraries within executive departments and independent agencies ... to the extent that the number does not exceed the number of major bureaus or divisions of the departments and independent agencies". The Act authorized a special designation for the Merchant Marine Academy, thereby increasing special designations for service academies to five. The number of special designations for executive department libraries has increased to twelve.

It was expected that the number of new depositories for independent agencies, and additional depositories for major bureaus or divisions of executive departments and independent agencies would fall between 25 and 250. As of April 1974, only 32 had been added as follows: independent agencies - 7; major bureaus/divisions of executive departments - 18; major bureaus/divisions of independent agencies - none; major bureaus/divisions of the Judicial Branch - 7 . Congressional libraries are not authorized to become depositories. The Library of Congress has no need for a designation since it receives federal government publications (depository and non-depository) under

section 1718 of Title 44. The National Archives, an executive branch agency receives government publications under section 1714 of Title 44, U.S. Code. While the Judicial Branch is not specifically mentioned in the Act, seven circuit court libraries have become depositories since 1971, five of them in 1973, presumably as "independent agencies". Meanwhile the Superintendent of Documents has reduced the total number possible under this provision to 125 libraries.[23] Although this may be a more reasonable estimate of the number of federal libraries which will take advantage of the provision, it is not an accurate estimate number of those qualified.The Federal Library Committee has compiled a directory which lists over 1,900 federal libraries,[24] most of which it is believed would qualify for depository status.

However, the fact that not many federal libraries wish to become depositories is welcome, since this type of depository fails to serve the basic purpose of the law expressed in section 1911, Title 44. The Public Printer pointed out this fact when the legislation was being considered. He suggested that this provision was designed merely as an "easy means" for agencies to acquire publications on automatic distribution from a central source.[25] This conclusion was verified by the witness representing the Executive Department in the Senate hearings. He testified that the main reason for wanting this provision was to obtain one-stop service in order to easily obtain government publications of other federal agencies for use by their own agency personnel.[26] Federal libraries were placed outside the regular depository library network and system when they were authorized to discard publications at any time by submitting them to the Library of Congress or National Archives, rather than to a regional depository. The Superintendent of Documents further interpreted the intent of the law that "Regional Depository Libraries have no jurisdiciton over depository libraries of the various agencies of the Federal Government within the Region they serve".[27] They are "responsible only to the Superintendent of Documents".

The fact of the matter is that many federal libraries are more concerned with publications of their own agency, many of which are non-GPO publications which they receive automatically through their own agency's internal distribution system. Many of these non-GPO publications are not available through depository distribution in any case. They are also able to receive many publications of outside agencies which they need automatically on mailing list distribution.

Non-GPO Publications

The "non-GPO publications" provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962 are incorporated in sections 1902 and 1903, Title 44, U.S. Code and would allow such publications to be distributed through the depository library system. Although non-GPO publications had not been specifically exempt previously from the program, as a practical matter depository distribution had been limited to publications printed by, or under supervision of the Government Printing Office.[28] This provision was a major breakthrough for documents librarians who for many years had been crying for better bibliographic control of

non-GPO publications. However, the breakthrough has not been exploited.

Unfortunately the Act contains several restrictive provisions which limit its effectiveness. Materials may be exempted from depository distribution if they are determined by the issuing agency to be "required for official use only or for strictly administrative purposes". The issuing agencies are also required to not only pay for the printing and binding of these publications, but (although not specifically mentioned in the Act) also to pay the cost of shipping them to the GPO depository distribution point. Thus they have little incentive to cooperate, and are provided a major loophole not to cooperate.

The Superintendent of Documents and the Public Printer have "not been overly enthusiastic about implementing the program",[29] and "GPO is doing less than it can to get the program into high gear".[30] Congress also has been less than willing to provide the necessary funds. The program was dealt a major blow in its first year when in 1963 the House Committee on Appropriations questioned "whether any significant portion of the (non-GPO) material would be of permanent value". The Committee was apparently appalled at the total price tag of $2 million to the issuing agencies and GPO to start the program.[31] In 1964, the Superintendent of Documents asked for, and received a token amount to start a pilot program with some Bureau of the Census and Department of the Interior (mainly Fish and Wildlife Service) publication series. In 1967 several series of Department of Labor publications were added. In 1968 tentative arrangements with the Department of the Treasury and Library of Congress were revealed, and in 1971 with the Department of State. These agreements never materialized, and the program still remains in a pilot status.[32]

However, part of the blame should also be placed at the feet of the documents librarian community, which after getting this part of the bill through over the very strong objections of the Public Printer has until recently shown little concern over the lack of compliance with the letter and spirt of the law. A resolution sponsored by the Government Documents Round Table and indorsed by ALA Council at the 1974 Midwinter Conference called upon the Superintendent of Documents as manager of the program to "ask for appropriations for additional personnel and resources in order to add new agencies to the program".[33]

There continues to be disagreement over the number of non-GPO publications, and their value. Based on my experience in collecting technical reports and standard publications from elements of the Department of Defense while serving at joint military service schools, I believe that librarians have overestimated their value and have underestimated the quantities involved and problems of bibliographic control. Support for this analysis was furnished by a knowledgeable witness at the 1962 Senate hearings, Mr. James Harrison at that time Public Printer and a former staff member of the Joint Committee on Printing. He stated the problem as follows:

> "Someone has to get in there with a pitchfork, and it literally amounts to that when you see these (non-GPO) publications."[34]

.. I just can't imagine the total amount of the number of publications that would be printed by the field printing system that we are talking about here. It is just astronomical.[35] ... I think that an evaluation has to be made as to whether there is enough to make the tremendous effort worldwide in separating the few grains of wheat from the many mountains of chaff".[36] (emphasis mine)

In 1962 a staff member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration estimated that non-GPO publications represented 60-65% of the total.[37] In 1972 the Public Printer gave an estimate of 85-90%, which I think is still too low. A difficulty in evaluating these or other estimates is that they are often based on dollar amounts expended or budgeted for printing, and not on the total number of titles produced which should be the criteria for comparison. Non-GPO publishing is characterized by small runs with cheaper equipment and paper, whereas GPO printing is characterized by large runs of a single title on more expensive paper using more expensive and sophisticated equipment. With respect to their value, Mr. Harrison testified in 1962 that "librarians themselves indicated to us that not more than 3 or 5 per cent of field publications (i.e. non-GPO) would be needed".[39] I have found no reference to support this figure; I feel it is too low. However, if it is accurate it would confirm Mr. Harrison's statement that it would indeed be a tremendous and costly effort to make "in separating the few grains of wheat from the many mountains of chaff".

III. WISCONSIN/NEW YORK EXPERIMENT

The concept of regional depository library service had its genesis in an experimental plan proposed in Wisconsin in 1953.[1] Staff members of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin had recognized space and disposal problems in the depository library system. In a series of conferences with other depositories in the state and with the Superintendent of Documents they sought ways to alleviate some of these problems. Prior to 1922 all depositories were required to accept all publications distributed, and to retain them permanently, with few exceptions granted by the Superintendent of Documents for ephemeral and superseded materials. Although the selective system introduced in 1922 allowed depositories to reduce the number of publications received, there were no provisions to discard these publications once their initial period of usefulness had passed.

Enabling legislation was passed by the Wisconsin legislature and was enacted as Chapter 161 of the Wisconsin Session Laws for 1953. This gave the State Historical Society authority to establish and operate a Central State Depository and Loan Collection for Federal Documents, and provided an appropriation of state funds for this purpose. The plan was put into operation by a directive issued by the Superintendent of Documents to all depository libraries in Wisconsin, dated June 2, 1953. (reproduced as Appendix D)

In consideration of the establishment of the central state depository and loan collection, the Superintendent of Documents authorized the State Historical Society to permit depositories in Wisconsin to discard depository materials more than 25 years old. The central collection would consist of the documents collection of the State Historical Society and University of Wisconsin Libraries, both located in the same block in Madison. There was no provision that the joint collection had to accept all depository items and retain them permanently such as was provided in the 1962 Act. The joint central depository was required to provide interlibrary loan to participating depositories on "less used documents" in order that they might make "a considerable reduction in the number of items which it has been necessary for them to select". However, the granting of the disposal privilege was "contingent upon the deletion from the depository selection of a substantial number of items which the libraries are now selecting".

In unusual cases, permission might be given to discard materials less than 25 years old. However, in this case the depository also had to delete from its selections the specific item under which these materials had been distributed. This provision was only useful if the depository no longer received the item, wished to discontinue the item, or if the item was dead. The depository did not have to discard all publications received under that item, but only the unwanted publications. In the case of unwanted publications over 25 years old, the depository did not have to delete the item from its selections, but had only to demonstrate that it had discontinued a significant number of items since 1922. If this was the case, it usually did not have to discontinue additional items to avail itself of the privilege.[2]

In order to use the disposal privilege, the depository was required to send a request to the Superintendent of Documents for permission to transfer materials more than 25 years old to the central state depository. It was not necessary to list the specific documents, series, or items in the initial request. When permission was granted, the central state depository would ask the discarding depository to send a list of the publications. It would screen the list, and if it contained any publications which it wished to add to its own collection, it would request the library to ship them. It would then send the list to other libraries in the state that had indicated an interest in adding to, or filling in gaps in their depository collections. The Society had previously canvassed libraries and other educational institutions in the state for those which wished to acquire older government documents. When all replies were received within a specified time period, the Society sent instructions to the holding library on where to send the requested materials. The receiving library was required to provide reimbursement for cost of transporation. The Society authorized the holding depository to dispose of the remaining materials in any appropriate mannner; but if this resulted in sale as scrap paper or used books, it required the library to send the proceeds to the Society which in turn transferred them to the Superintendent of Documents for deposit in the account of the United States Treasury.

The Wisconsin plan was designed primarily to provide a means of discarding material received prior to 1922 when depository libraries did not have the selection option. The 25 years retention requirement was too long to be of much significant value, and it was subsequently reduced to 5 years in the Depository Library Act of 1962. The plan as approved by the Superintendent of Documents was intended primarily for participation in, and benefit by, depository libraries. However, in the implementation of the plan (which was assisted by state funds), the Society allowed any library in the state to borrow documents on interlibrary loan from the central collection. It also authorized individual citizens to borrow direct from the central collection if they did not have access to local library services which could process interlibrary loan requests.

Several years later a similar plan was worked out by the New York State Library in coordination with the Superintendent of Documents.[3] By a document dated February 15, 1956 (reproduced as Appendix E) the Superintendent of Documents authorized similar disposal privileges to all depository libraries in the State of New York, exclusive of New York City in consideration of the establishment by the New York State Library of a central depository and loan collection. These depositories were authorized to transfer control of depository publications over 25 years old to the central depository, and gave the New York State Library permission to coordinate the disposal of this material. However, this agreement did not contain the provision of the Wisconsin agreement that such requests were contingent upon the depository having deleted a substantial number of items.

The New York agreement contained a similar agreement with respect to publications under 25 years old. Permission would not be granted unless the library had requested deletion of the current item number under which the unwanted publications had been distributed. Also in this case, requests submitted to the Superintendent of Documents had to list the specific publications. The agreement was, of course, contingent upon the New York State Library maintaining a comprehensive central collection, and providing interlibrary loan on older, and/or less used publications. The New York agreement also contained a provision with respect to Serial Set volumes which was not in the Wisconsin plan. If Serial Set volumes were not wanted by the New York depositories, the list of Serial Set numbers was to be submitted to the Superintendent of Documents who would offer them to other depositories throughout the country for a period of six months. If there were no requests during that time, the discarding library might then dispose of them in accordance with instructions from the New York State Library.

The Wisconsin/New York experiment was a step in the right direction. The 25 year retention requirement was too long, but it will be seen that many features of these plans were incorporated into the Depository Library Act of 1962 and the implementing Instructions of the Superintendent of Documents. Any state might have established a central depository and loan collection for federal documents without the approval of the Superintendent of Documents. The regional concept of cooperation had been applied throughout the country for regular library materials. It was the inclusion of the disposal provision which could only be granted by a responsible agency of the federal government that made the plan viable. Depository publications are the property of the federal government, and cannot be discarded except as authorized by federal law.

IV. ORGANIZATION

Designation and Functions of Regional Depositories

The Depository Library Act of 1962 provides for designation and functions of regional depository libraries as follows:

> "Not more than two depository libraries in each State and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may be designated as regional depositories and shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to depository libraries. Designation of regional depository libraries may be made by a Senator or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico within the areas served by them, after approval by the head of the library authority of the State or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as the case may be, who shall first ascertain from the head of the library to be so designated that the library will, in addition to fulfilling the requirements for depository libraries, retain at least one copy of all Government publications either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents); and within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publications. The agreement to function as a regional depository library shall be transmitted to the Superintendent of Documents by the Senator or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico when the designation is made".[1]

In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, Revised July 1974 the Superintendent of Documents also authorized the Governor of the Virgin Islands to designate a regional depository library.[2] He also declared that "Regional Depository Libraries have no jurisdiction over depository libraries in the various agencies of the Federal Government within the region they serve". This would then leave any non-federal depository libraries in American Samoa, Canal Zone, District of Columbia, and Guam without regional library services. There could be some question whether or not some of the depositories in these federal enclaves are federal libraries. Almost all of the depositories in the District of Columbia are federal libraries. However, the Commissioner of the District is authorized two designations, and one has been assigned to Georgetown University; Federal City College has used a land grant college designation; and the D.C. Public Library obtained depository status in 1943 by individual special designation. It should probably be assumed that a "federal library" for purposes of the law is one which has used that provision in the law to obtain a designation.

Numbers, Types, and Service Areas

By late 1974, 41 libraries had accepted in full the added responsibilities of a regional, and four other libraries had accepted these responsibilities in part by forming two joint regional depositories, (see Appendix G for list of regional depository libraries) These

libraries are located in 36 states, and provide regional services to depositories in 38 states. Seven states have two regional depositories: i.e. Arizona, Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Texas, and Wisconsin. However, the two states with the largest number of depositories as of June 1974 still have only one regional: California, with 91 depositories, and New York with 72. On the other extreme, Arizona and New Mexico each with ten depositories apiece have two regionals. One of the seven Wyoming depositories is a regional, and one of the six Nevada depositories is a regional.

Although each state is authorized to have two regionals, it was not expected that each state would need and request two regionals.[3] The Wisconsin/New York experiment seemed to indicate that most states would need only one regional, and only the larger states would need two. In fact, although it is not specifically mentioned in the Act, it was expected that some regional depositories would be truly "regional" and would provide service to more than one state, particularly in the case of smaller states on the Eastern seaboard, or the sparsely settled states in the mountain and western areas.[4] This had been done in two cases. The University of Maine Library serves not only the other 16 depositories in Maine, but also the nine depositories in neighboring New Hampshire, and eight in Vermont. The Denver Public Library served the seven depositories in Wyoming from 1972 to 1974 on a temporary basis until the Wyoming State Library was prepared to assume the regional responsibilities in August 1974. In addition to the territories, and the District of Columbia that are not authorized regional depositories, this leaves the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the following 12 states without regional depository services: Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Tennessee. Two of these are small eastern states (Rhode Island and Delaware) which might request the regional depository in a neighboring state to serve them. The District of Columbia might also be added to this group.

There are two joint regional depositories in which responsibilities are shared, primarily with respect to selection of items and the holdings of each partner to insure that the joint regional accepts all depository items in compliance with the law. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has been the primary partner in a joint regional with the cooperating University of Wisconsin Library since the experimental stage in 1953. The main division of responsibility concerns item selection and holdings. The State Historical Society Library has accepted responsibility for processing interlibrary loan and disposal requests and providing reference service, with backup support from the University of Wisconsin Library as needed. The two North Dakota partners have also divided responsbility for item selection and holdings. However, the North Dakota State University Library (the primary partner) and the cooperating Library at the University of North Dakota otherwise act independently, with both accepting interlibrary loan and disposal requests and providing reference service primarily on a geographical basis since they are separated by 75 miles. The two Wisconsin partners are located in the same city block.

Although the Act allows each state two regionals, neither it nor the implementing Instructions of the Superintendent of Documents prescribe how the responsibilities within the state shall be divided. This has been left for the two libraries to work out on a cooperative basis. However, it was expected that geography would probably dictate the need for two regionals, and therefore the division would be made on that basis. The best example of this in practice is the large state of Texas with 52 depositories. Texas State Library in Austin serves the southern part of the state, and Texas Tech University Library in Lubbock serves the northern part. Geography is the main basis for division of responsibility also in Arizona, Michigan, and Wisconsin. In New Mexico, the division of responsibility is primarily by type of library: New Mexico State Library serves the public libraries, and the University of New Mexico serves the academic libraries. In Colorado, the division of responsibilities is based on a combination of geographic factors and type of library: Denver Public Library serves all Denver area libraries, plus all public libraries, federal agencies, and private colleges in the rest of the state. The University of Colorado serves all other academic libraries in the state. Division of responsibility might also be made according to function, although this was not reported. One depository might process all interlibrary loan requests and provide reference service, and the other depository might process all disposal requests, or any other combination thereof.

Of the 45 libraries which have accepted regional responsibilities in whole or in part, 16 or 36% are state libraries; 24 or 53% are academic libraries; the remaining 5 or 11% are public libraries. This illustrates the preeminence of academic libraries in the depository library system. On an overall basis they account for 745, or 65% of all depositories. The breakdown for the remaining depositories as of April 1974 is as follows: 78 state libraries (including state appellate courts), or 7%; 261 public libraries, or 23%; 15 special libraries, or 1%; and 49 federal libraries, or 4% of the total. A further breakdown by state will be found in Appendix I.

During the 1957-1958 House hearings and 1962 Senate hearings, it was apparently expected that the state libraries would almost automatically assume the regional depository library responsibilities.[5] They are the logical candidates, since state library agencies already have responsibilities to support library services throughout the state. Each state had also been authorized one special designation for a "state library", and each had used it by late 1962. However, the state library which used that special designation is in many cases not the state library agency. The designation has been taken by libraries with a wide variety of functions, which illustrate the diversity of organization for state library services: state supreme court library, legislative reference service, historical society, service to state agencies in the capital, general lending or traveling library, library commission, or any combination thereof. Thus, many state libraries do not have (or need) a complete collection of federal documents. The main requirement for a regional is that it should be able and willing to accept and retain permanently all publications distributed to depository libraries.

Beyond the state libraries, the next logical candidates are the state universities and/or land grant universities. All land grant universities are authorized a special designation, and those state universities which are not land grant have obtained depository status with congressional designations. Most of these libraries consider themselves to be research libraries and generally select a high percentage of the available items, and retain most of them permanently. However, state universities do not generally have responsibilities for providing library services statewide, and they may be reluctant to assume the added regional responsibilities without being provided some additional financial support. This support might come from the state library agency, or from the federal government.

The next category of candidates for regional depositories are the large public libraries in metropolitan areas. Many of these are research libraries, have been depositories for many years, have excellent retrospective collections, and also select a high percentage of the available depository items. In some cases they may also have responsibilities for providing interlibrary loan service statewide, particularly in those states where the state library does not have the collections, or the library organization to support these services.

Organization for Documents Service

In Part I of the Survey there are nine questions dealing primarily with the internal organization of the library to provide government documents service. Such questions would have been appropriate for any large research library which is a depository. As a general rule, regional depositories are research libraries. Research libraries which are not regionals also generally select a very high percentage of depository items (90% or more), and retain most of them permanently. Research libraries generally also collect significant numbers of other types of government documents and maintain large collections (often separate) of such materials: non-depository U.S. documents, technical reports, state documents, foreign documents, and international documents. This part of the report may be of interest to documents librarians at university and other research libraries.

Although I did not specifically ask the question, I believe that most regional librarians would agree that the ideal library organization for a regional depository would be a separate government documents department, with a separate collection of U.S. government documents shelved according to the Superintendent of Documents classification system. The head of the separate documents department should preferably report to the Director of the Library. The reasons for this are as follows. When documents are organized in a separate collection, this insures not only that the entire collection is large (thereby increasing the responsibility and status of the documents librarian) but also that all technical service and public service type functions from acquisition and cataloging to shelf maintenance and reference are concentrated in one organization. This insures having documents librarians knowledgeable in all phases of documents work. Primary use of the Superintendent of Documents classification

system also insures that holding records or shelf lists have this significant information which allows efficient processing of disposal requests. It also permits knowledgeable assistance to other depositories, most of whom have used (or will want to use) the readily available standard SuDocs classification system for their separate collection. A separate collection with documents under the control of the documents librarian also permits more efficent interlibrary loan.

In question 1, I asked regional librarians to describe whether their collection of U.S. government documents is separate, integrated, or separate/partially integrated. The response broken down by type of library was as follows:

	Academic	State	Public	Total
a. Separate	11	9	2	22
b. Integrated	0	1	2	3
c. Separate/partially integrated ...	13	1	4	18

Next I asked those libraries which reported they have a separate-partially integrated collection to provide an estimate in percentages of the number of titles in the separate and integrated collections of the main library and branch libraries, and also an estimate in percentages of shelf space occupied by each category. The average total figure for titles in the separate collection, and shelf space occupied by them was approximately 80%. Three university libraries reported significant amounts of the collection shelved in various branch libraries: two reported 10%, one 20%, and a fourth 40% of the documents collection dispersed to the branch libraries.

The Survey did not ask what kind of titles or series are integrated. At the University of Maryland, a regional depository we find that the following types of serials adapt themselves well to integration:

(1) Periodicals.
(2) Monograph series, such as:
(a) Numbered publications in series which use a simple consecutive numbering system (ex. Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletins)
(b) Decisions/Opinions of courts and administrative or regulatory agencies (ex. U.S. Reports, I.C.C. Reports, Internal Revenue Bulletin)
(c) Other legal materials (ex. U.S. Code, Code of Federal Regulations, U.S. Treaties)
(3) Annual reports of executive departments and independent agencies.
(4) Significant yearbooks, and annual statistical compilations (ex. Yearbook of Agriculture, HUD Statistical Yearbook)
(5) Final bound census reports.

Significant separates and monographs are also integrated into the regular collection, such as reports of Presidential advisory committees. In the case of such significant works, an extra copy may be obtained by purchase or gift for integration, with the depository copy remaining in the separate collection.

In question 3, I asked for a description of the organization which services the U.S. government documents collection. The response was as follows:

a. Separate government documents department/division - 17
   Head reports to: Library Director - 4
   Assistant Director, Reader Services - 11
   Assistant Director, Technical Svcs - 2

b. Separate government documents section - 16
   Part of ---------- Division/Department
   Business, Economics, and/or Social Sciences - 4
   General Reference - 12

c. Not a separate unit - 7
   Personnel responsible for U.S. documents are part of:
   General Reference Department - 3
   Social Sciences Reference Department - 2
   Combination (Serials and Reference Departments) - 2

Of the 40 libraries which had furnished information for this question, 33 had a separate documents unit; 17 of these are at the top operating level in the library hierarchy, and 16 are at the middle level. Of the seven depository libraries without a separate documents unit, four are academic libraries, two are public libraries, and one is a state library. The response also verified the belief that government documents service is usually assigned to readers/public service elements, rather than to technical services. Within readers/public services, it is usually considered a function of the reference department. If reference services are broken down by subject groupings, government documents are usually found in a social sciences reference unit.

In question 4, I asked the regionals to designate what other collections of government documents and/or related materials the units and/or personnel primarily responsible for federal government documents also handled. The response from 38 regionals was as follows:

Other Government Documents	Related Materials
State documents - 22	Maps - 14
Local documents - 17	Legal materials - 7
International documents-19	Newspapers - 2
Foreign documents - 16	Microforms of government documents - 26
Technical reports - 16	
AEC reports - 20	
NASA reports - 20	
ERIC reports - 12	

The U.S. government doucments depository collection usually forms the nucleus of a separate documents collection. This is, of course, augmented by U.S. government publications which are not received on depository distribution: from Documents Expediting Project and mailing lists, as gifts and purchases which may include duplicate copies of depository publications, but consist mainly of non-GPO publications.

Such a unit will also normally handle other government documents, particularly international and foreign documents. However, other library units (especially in academic libraries) may handle state/local documents and technical reports. Most state universities have a separate department, usually under Special Collections rather than Reference Services, which specializes in materials related to the home state. This department may also handle state documents. Technical reports may be handled by a branch library or subject reference department devoted to the sciences. At the University of Maryland Library, the Maryland Room handles Maryland state documents; the Engineering and Physical Sciences Library has a Technical Reports section whose nucleus is formed by AEC and NASA technical reports; and a Technology and Science Reference Room handles the collection of state agricultural extension agency reports.

The inclusion of these and other questions in Part I on organization is indirectly related to other questions in Part VI of the Survey dealing with financial support. Federal financial support should presumably be applied to the operation and servicing of the "depository collection", or on a more narrow scope to compensate for the added costs of performing strictly regional functions. However, it is difficult to isolate these costs, since the "depository collection" is usually incorporated into a large U.S. documents collection consisting of both depository and non-depository publications. It in turn is usually serviced by a separate documents unit which is responsible for servicing other types of government documents and related materials. Responsibility for servicing the "depository collection" may also be fragmented among various personnel and units throughout the library.

A separate documents unit often has responsibility for servicing related types of materials. Many of these libraries are also depositories for government maps of the Geological Survey and Army Map Service. The problems of servicing such a special collection are similar to those in servicing government publications. Thus, placement of the map collection (whose nucleus consists of government maps) in a separate documents unit is a logical step. Another logical organizational step is to assign to a separate documents unit the responsibility for servicing the collection of legal materials. Many legal materials are provided through depository distribution: bills, hearings, reports, Congressional Record, laws and statutes, Federal Register and administrative law, decisions of courts and regulatory agencies, and treaties. This explains why so many law school libraries have become depositories, and why they want special designations. Another logical organizational move is to assign responsibility for servicing of microforms of government documents to a separate documents unit. Even if microforms are centralized in the library, microforms of government documents often form a large collection and may be placed in the documents unit as an exception.

In questions 5 and 6, I asked whether the U.S. government documents librarian or unit are responsible for both technical service functions (receiving and processing shipments, and maintaining the shelf list) and readers service functions (reference and shelf maintenance) for

U.S. government documents. Although separate documents units and documents librarians are normally assigned to public service departments, they are usually responsible for the four main library functions dealing with government documents which are usually fragmented for regular library materials: i.e. acquisitions, cataloging and serials, reference, and stack maintenance and circulation. They are responsible for both groups of functions with a few exceptions at regional depositories. In only three regionals are documents librarians not responsible for the main technical service functions. In one state university and one public library, they are neither responsible for processing of incoming shipments or maintaining the shelf list. In only three libraries are documents librarians not responsible for readers service functions. At one public library, they are not responsible for reference service or shelf maintenance. At one state library, while they are responsible for the stacks, they are not responsible for reference service. At one public library they are responsible for reference service, but not for maintaining the separate documents collection in the stacks.

The concept of the special collection for government documents is based on minimum amount of cataloging, and dependence on printed catalogs and indexes. The basic philosophy is that documents librarians can provide better reference service for the collection if they handle the other library functions pertaining to the materials. If they check in and process the material and maintain the shelf list, they will be more familiar with the documents in the collection.

In question 7, I asked for data on staffing for government documents service broken down by professional, paraprofessinnal, and other assistants for the U.S. documents collection, and for the entire documents unit if there is a separate unit. The average staffing of the 38 regionals which submitted usable information is as follows:

	U.S. Docs	Other Docs	TOTAL
Librarians (professional)....	1.43	0.58	2.01
Library assistants ..... (para-professional)	1.70	0.50	2.20
Student/Other assistants	1.72	0.46	2.18
TOTAL:	4.85	1.54	6.39

In question 8, I asked for data regarding the amount of time which other library units or personnel contributed to servicing the depository collection, specifically: acquisitions, cataloging, serials, reference, circulation, stack, and interlibrary loan departments. I did not obtain any usable data from the response.

The data obtained from question 7 should be used with caution. The data on staffing for U.S. government documents is reasonably accurate, except for the reasons given below and also for the fact as explained above that I did not get usable data on the amount of time

other library personnel and units contributed to servicing the documents collection. The average figures on staffing for other documents and related materials in the separate documents unit (including also the totals) are less reliable. There is a wide variation on the types and amounts of other documents and related materials which the separate documents units handle at the different regionals. Also seven of the regionals do not have a separate documents unit.

I did not ask how many hours of reference service is provided, and who provides this service. Maintaining a reference service point can be very costly in man hours, particularly for the academic library which is normally open more hours during the week than other types of libraries. The University of Maryland Library is probably typical in this regard by being open 8a.m. to midnight on weekdays, 10a.m. to 6p.m. on Saturdays, and nonn to midnight on Sunday for a total of 100 hours per week. On the other hand a state library is usually open only during normal work hours 8-5 daily, or 45 hours per week. The typical public library is somewhere in between. It will open later in the morning than the university library, close earlier in the evening, and will be closed on Sunday. It is usually not necessary to staff a documents service point full time during the day. The documents librarian can perform other duties during regular hours, and handle questions on demand. I also find that separate documents units do not have personnel on duty during all the hours the library is open. This is particularly true (as it is for most special collections) during the evening hours and week-ends. In these cases, the reference department may provide limited service if the documents collection is located in open stacks, and the documents reference room with its Monthly Catalog and other bibliographies is also open. Even if the stacks and reference room are open, another aspect of documents organization and service may hinder provision of reference service during these evening and week-end periods: i.e. location of the shelf list. The shelf list is usually the only record to the holdings of the collection, and it is normally kept in the documents office where it is not available to the public. The stacks and reference room may be open, but the documents office with the shelf list may be closed, thus limiting service during those evening and week-end periods.

V. RETENTION POLICY AND MICROFORMS

The Depository Library Act of 1962 requires that regional depositories "shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to depository libraries" and shall "retain at least one copy of all Government publications either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents)". In section 11 of his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents provides blanket authority to depository libraries to discard 13 categories of materials, mainly ephemeral publications and those which have been revised or superseded.

This second part of the survey attempted to learn if this permanent retention and microform substitution policy had any effect on the operations and collections of regional depositories. It also investigated the reaction of regional depositories to the proposed micropublishing project of the Government Printing Office.

In this survey, I asked specifically about the retention policy for only one category of publications listed in section 11: i.e. bills and resolutions. In my 1972 survey I had inquired about other categories of materials which regional depositories are authorized to discard. I concluded then (and still believe) that the fact that regional depositories are required to maintain the permanent collection of depository publications for their region did not alter in any way their policy towards those categories of material mentioned in section 11, Instructions to Depository Libraries. If they chose to retain any of these materials (the exception, rather than the rule) they did so only for local reasons to better serve their own clientelle, or in some cases to provide duplicates for circulation or interlibrary loan. They continue to discard revised editions and superseded publications, although they may retain some older editions selectively for historical purposes. They continue to discard the individual Congressional reports and documents (after the Serial Set volumes are received), although they may retain selectively some significant documents and reports. In the case of some reports to Congress by executive and independent agencies which are not furnished in departmental editions, they may file the individual documents under the author as issuing agency.

Bills and Resolutions

In question 10, I asked regional depositories if they held bills and resolutions more than two years beyond the close of a Congress. All depositories are authorized to discard them one year after the close of a Congress. However, our library keeps bills of the previous Congress until the end of the current Congress, a total of two years. The majority, or 26 regionals, replied that they did not keep bills and resolutions longer than two years after the close of the Congress. Fifteen regionals reported that they hold bills longer. Of these, four keep bills of the last two Congresses, one for the last three Congresses, and one for the last four Congresses, and two for the

past five Congresses. Three regionals have retained bills and resolutions from the 76th Congress (or the first Congress they were made available on depository distribution) to the present. One regional retains bills from the 84th Congress to the present, and another from the 86th Congress to the present.

In question 11, I asked the regionals if they bought microform copies of older bills and resolutions, and if so, to list their holdings. Five regionals replied that they bought a microform edition of bills of previous Congresses. Their holdings were reported as follows. Two regionals have LC microfilm for the 1st to the 72d Congress, plus CIS microfiche for bills of the 92d Congress. One regional reported holdings of LC microfilm from the 1st to the 15th Congress, and another for the 1st through the 55th Congress. Another regional reported that bills are contained on its Microprint holdings for 1957-1960.

The Library of Congress has a continuing project to copy bills and resolutions of past Congresses on microfilm. It started with the first Congress, and has worked forward in time. On the other hand, the Congressional Information Service (CIS) is also making bills and resolutions available on microform, but is using a microfiche format. It started with the last Congress (92d) and is working backward in time, presumably to the point where the Library of Congress project will terminate so as not to duplicate coverage. This is one type of document which lends itself to microform copy and use, being quite voluminous and generally little used. They are, however, critical to thorough research in tracing legislation. The hearings usually include a copy of the bill(s) under consideration. However, they do not include the many amendments subsequently introduced, or bills of a similar nature from a previous Congress on which no action was taken.

Selective Microform Holdings

In question 12, I asked regionals to report their holdings of microform for five major categories of materials which are presently available commercially in various microform formats and editions: Congressional Serial Set, Proceedings of Congress, Federal Register, Patent Office Official Gazette, and Microprint Edition of Depository Publications. I also asked them to indicate their retention policy for these categories by checking whether they retain "all", "most", "some", or "none" of the duplicate hard copy which they may discard.

The Microprint Corporation has made the Congressional Serial Set available on opaque microprint format from Serial no. 1 (15th Congress, 1817) through Serial no. 8521 (68th Congress, 1925). In this category the main reason a library may purchase the microform edition is that it does not have the hard copy which is no longer in print and is often unavailable except on exchange lists, rather than to substitute microform for hard copy. Twenty regionals reported they had some holdings, but only fifteen provided specific information. These fifteen regionals have holdings from Serial no.1 (15th Congress) to anywhere up to the 21st Congress (4 regionals), to the 33rd, 39th, 44th, 47th, 48th, 52d, 54th, 66th Congress, or the latest available.

The holdings at our library go through the 54th Congress, and were purchased mainly to fill in gaps in our holdings of hard copy. We retain all hard copy volumes which are duplicated in microform, as do twelve other regionals. Five regionals reported that they discard all duplicate hard copy, one regional retains most duplicate hard copy, and one retains some duplicates selectively. Meanwhile another publisher, the Congressional Information Service, is offering the Congressional Serial Set in a microfiche edition. A transparent microform format, such as microfiche, is generally preferred to an opaque format, like Microprint.

Sixteen regionals reported that they have some years of the Proceedings of Congress in a microform edition. Most of those who reported their specific holdings indicated that these cover the period prior to the beginning of the Congressional Record, and are for the earlier Congresses as follows: 1st-25th, 1st-42d, and 23d-42d Congresses. The predecessors to the Congressional Record are: Annals of Congress (1st-18th Congress), Register of Debates (18th-25th Congress), Congressional Globe (23d-42d Congress). Two regionals reported holdings from the 1st to the present Congress. However, one of these reported that the holdings cover gaps only in the bound volumes. Eleven regionals reported they retain all duplicate hard copy, and only three reported they retain no duplicate hard copy volumes. Two regionals reported that they retain some duplicate hard copy on a selective basis.

It was anticipated that a different picture would emerge for the Federal Register. These are not furnished in bound volumes like the Congressional Record and Congressional Serial Set; and the paper is of poorer quality. Twenty two regionals reported they have some holdings, but only sixteen reported their specific holdings of the microform edition. Nine of these have from volume 1 (1936) to the present. The beginning years for the other holdings reported through the present are as follows: 1939, 1950, 1952, 1955, 1963, 1965, and 1969. As expected the majority, or 14 regionals, reported that they did not retain any duplicate hard copy. Only four regionals reported they retain all duplicate originals. Three regionals reported they retain "some" duplicate hard copy, and one retains "most" duplicate copies.

Another voluminous serial which is available in a microform edition is the Official Gazette of the Patent Office. Eighteen regionals reported some holdings, but only nine regionals reported their specific holdings. Seven have the microform edition from 1872 to the present. Three other regionals are currently buying this serial in microform and have holdings back to 1950 (2 regionals) and 1967 (1 regional). The retention policy is somewhat mixed. Nine libraries reported they retain all duplicate hard copy, one retains "most", and three retain "some" duplicates. Five regionals discard all hard copy duplicates.

Only two regionals reported they have some holdings of the Microprint Edition of Depository Publications. This service is available from 1956 to the present. However, these two libraries reported that they retain all duplicate hard copy.

GPO Micropublishing Project

In question 13, I asked regional libraries to list significant specific items, or types of items for which they had indicated a preference for microform copy on Part II, 1973 Biennial Report of Depository Libraries. This survey was circulated to depositories in February 1974 in connection with the Government Printing Office Micropublishing Project which had been first proposed in 1970. It included 102 pages on which were listed 2,812 depository items which were presently available. Depository libraries were asked to check one of two blocks marked "P" (paper) and "F" (film) to indicate their preference for hard copy (paper) or microcopy (film) on those items which they were currently receiving, or which they might elect to receive if a microform copy were available.

Some brief preliminary data on the response has been released by the Government Printing Office.[1] The Microform Program Manager has also given status reports at several meetings during the ALA Annual Conference at New York in July 1974 and at a government documents workshop in October 1974 at Richmond, Virginia. He reported that the degree of preference for microform by different types of depository libraries was as follows: federal libraries-19%; regional depositories-35%; selective non-federal libraries-32%; and overall average was 29.6%[2]. However, any figures based on items can be misleading. An item may represent one publication per year (annual report), thousands of pieces per year (Army Regulations, or Federal Specifications and Standards), or ten of thousands of pieces per year (bills and resolutions). It was also reported later that the list included almost 400 dead or dormant depository items.

The covering letter which accompanied the survey did not provide the basic criteria which would govern the types of materials which might be made available on microform. From information obtained from various sources prior to, and after the survey was made, it appears that the following criteria (taking into account various economic, technical and feasability factors) would govern. Publication of microform will be daily or concurrently with (or even preceding) publication of hard copy. There will be no retrospective filming, or filming of retrospective collections. Only one document will be placed on one fiche, or fiche series. The basic format will be standard microfiche (24:1 reduction ration, 98 frames per fiche). The item (series) will be the basis of selection. The depository must accept all publications in a series in either microform, or hard copy. A summary of item selection response by regionals to the GPO survey has been extracted from the GPO report. (see Appendix H)

Given the criteria mentioned above with its various restraints, it would appear that several good candidates for microform would have to be eliminated immediately, such as bills and resolutions and the Daily Statement of the Treasury. Bills and resolutions would have to be filmed retrospectively at the end of each Congress when all amendments could be interfiled and filming done in chronological and numerical sequence. More than one document should also be placed on

one fiche since many bills take only one page. The Daily Statement of the Treasury would also have to be filmed retrospectively, preferably at the end of each month, since each issue occupies only two pages. It would be a waste of microfiche to place only one single page or two page document on a 98-frame fiche.

However, the most useful information in the GPO report was the all too brief analysis of the types of materials which depositories wish to receive in microform. It was reported that "congressional, educational, agricultural, and bound documentation of all kinds lead in microform preference".[2] In my own survey I attempted to get some feel for the types of materials which regional librarians at research libraries believe are suitable for use in microform.

The single characteristic which was mentioned most frequently (7 times) was "little used materials". The next most mentioned characteristic was "items covered by an index" (3 times). Other general characteristics mentioned at least once were: "easy to use", "long runs", and "space consuming" materials.

With respect to specific groups or categories, Congressional and legal materials were mentioned frequently, with number of times shown in parenthesis: Federal Register (3), laws (3), hearings (3), bills (2), Congressional Record (2), Serial Set (2), and decisions (1). Military publications were also mentioned frequently as follows: DOD publications (4), Army Regulations (3), Federal Item Identification Guides (1), Fleet Marine Force Manuals (1), Air Force Manuals (1), DSA handbooks (1), DSA Manuals (1), lists of officers (1), and DOD periodicals (1). The following general types of publications were also mentioned as follows, many of them are also related to military publication series: technical reports (3), manuals (2), handbooks (2), regulations (2), and specifications and standards (2).

Soil surveys were mentioned twice and Agriculture Department publications once. The following were mentioned twice: Patent Office Official Gazette, Catalog of Copyright Entries, and annual reports. The following were mentioned once each: tidal current tables. statistical (especially Census) publications, current industrial reports, National electric rate books, FAA handbooks, and addresses.

Meanwhile, the Public Printer plans to conduct a pilot project with 21 participating depository libraries, using the Code of Federal Regulations in microform as the pilot vehicle. The plan was first submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing on August 17, 1974 but approval has been slow in coming. The 21 test libraries include 16 academic libraries, 4 state libraries, and only one public library. Fourteen of these libraries are regionals. They are indicated on Appendix H which also lists the non-regional participants. In addition to the test libraries, technical evaluation will be provided by a group of federal agencies, commercial firms, organizations, and individuals.

In question 14, I asked for other comments on retention policy or the GPO micropublishing project. These have been extracted and are listed on Appendix J without comment or analysis.

VI. DISPOSAL POLICY

The Depository Library Act of 1962 provides that "the libraries designated as regional depositories may permit depository libraries, within the areas served by them, to dispose of Government publications which they have retained for five years after first offering them to other depository libraries within their area, then to other libraries". Federal libraries which are depositories may discard them at any time by offering them to the Library of Congress and National Archives. The 1972 law which authorized special designations for the libraries of state appellate courts exempted them from the provisions of section 1912, Title 44, U.S. Code which includes the requirement for selective depositories to hold depository publications at least five years. In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents authorized them to discard publications at any time by offering them to a regional depository if they are located in a state served by a regional; if there is no regional depository in the state, they may offer them to the State Library.

In his Special Instructions to Regional Depositories, dated November 7, 1962 (reproduced as Appendix J) the Superintendent of Documents offered guidance to regional depositories on how to process disposal requests since this was not spelled out in detail in the Act. These instructions were subsequently incorporated into Section 2 of the Instructions to Depository Libraries, Revised July 1974 (reproduced as Appendix F). They had not appeared in the earlier 1967 edition. In my 1972 report I had concluded that there are three main areas in which disposal policy differs among regional depositories: (1) whether a detailed or a general list of unwanted publications is required; (2) the geographical extent to which takers for the discarded publications are sought; and (3) whether the offerings to other libraries are made by the regional or by the selective depositories.

General vs. Detailed List

In his Special Instructions to Regional Depositories, dated November 7, 1962, the Superintendent of Documents suggested that regionals should ask the selective depository wishing to discard publications to submit a list of the publications "showing the current item number, series, and approximate extent of holdings". The revised Instructions to Depository Libraries retains this language but adds the requirement that the list should also include the Superintendent of Documents number.

In question 15, I asked whether a general or detailed list was required in regard to two types of publications. Almost all regionals are satisfied with a general list of numbered publications in series (ex. Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletins) or Congressional Serial Set on which are listed the inclusive numbers, or the specific publication numbers. (ex. BLS Bulletins 1175-1731) However, only four out of 33 regionals who answered this question are satisfied with a general list showing approximate holdings for unnumbered or general publications which have a Cuttered book number, and numbered publications with a complicated numbering system. (ex. House Committee on

Foreign Affairs, hearings, 1949-1969, 185 pieces) In this case the large majority require a detailed list giving the title, date, and Superintendent of Documents (SuDocs) number for each piece.

The purpose of the list is to give enough information so that the regional depository can process it, and the prospective takers (including the regional) can identify the materials from their records to determine if they want any of them. There is generally little uniformity in these lists. This is usually due to the manner in which the holding records or shelf list are maintained by the discarding library, and/or the regional depository. The regional depository may prescribe a format which will make it convenient for it to check the discard lists against its own holdings records. If it maintains its records in alphabetical order, it may require the discarding library to include the issuing agency, and to list the publications alphabetically by issuing agency, and by publication and/or series title. If it maintains its records in shelf list order, it may not require that the issuing agency be included, but it normally will require a SuDocs number for each entry, and that the entries are listed in shelf list order. Several regionals also require depositories to indicate condition of the materials, and whether they are bound or unbound.

Some problems may arise for the discarding library in describing the materials from its records. If it has integrated the materials, the records may not show the SuDocs numbers, and the librarian[2] may have to search the Monthly Catalog, Andriot,[3] Lester,[4] and/or Poole[5] to find these numbers. They may also have caused problems for themselves by tampering with the permanently assigned SuDocs numbers when there has been a reclassification due to reorganization within the Federal government affecting the issuing agency. Some documents librarians may continue to use the old class stem, and disregard the new SuDocs number. Other documents librarians may use the new class stem when it is assigned, but they may change all the old SuDocs numbers on the publications and the holdings records to the new SuDocs number in order to have the same publication series shelved together in the stacks.[6] Either practice is bad and defeats the advantages gained from using a standard classification numbering system which is almost universally applied. The disadvantages are apparent when it becomes necessary to list this reclassified material on a disposal list.

Offerings of Unwanted Publications

In question 16, I asked whether the regional or selective depository circulated the offering list to other depository libraries in the state as required by law. Twenty regionals reported that they circulate these offering lists, while the sixteen other regionals who responded reported that they require the selective depository to make the subsequent offerings.

The Act requires that the publications should be offered first to "other depository libraries within their area, then to other libraries". The Superintendent of Documents offers the following clarification in his implementing Instructions. "Publications should be first offered

to other depository libraries in the State or States, then to some other library or educational institution in the vicinity or area which would be able to make them available to the public and to which requests might be referred". The response to question 17 indicated that regional depositories comply with the law with respect to offering discards within the State or region. In response to question 18, 27 regionals reported that they go beyond the requirements of the law and circulate offering lists of discards out of state as well. The other 17 regionals who answered this question do not circulate such lists out of state.

When a regional depository circulates the offering lists, it will usually use a consolidated list in which the offerings of several depositories are included. These offerings from several libraries may be listed separately, or they may be merged into one master list. In the latter case, it is usually impossible for the library receiving the list to know where the materials are located. When making the offerings, whether on a consolidated or single list, whether by the regional or selective depository, a simultaneous offering may be made to all prospective recipients rather than making two separate offerings to the two groups of libraries mentioned in the Act. From the response I was unable to determine whether the simultaneous offering is used, or if the normal practice is to make two separate offerings, first to depository libraries in the state, then to non-depository libraries in the state and out of state libraries. Normally a simultaneous offering should employ a "some-for-all" or "something-for-everybody" feature. This differs from the traditional "first-come-first-served" policy in that all recipients of the offering list are given a deadline in which to reply, usually 30-45 days. At the end of the deadline, all answers are then considered. In order to comply with the law certain priorities are assigned in filling requests, as follows: (1) all depository libraries in the region; (2) all libraries and educational institutions in the congressional district of the discarding library; and (3) all other libraries and institutions, in state and out of state. However, only seven regionals reported that they use the "some-for-all" feature, while 28 reported that they continue to use the traditional "first-come-first-served" policy.

In response to question 19, 26 regional librarians reported that they favor the exchange of discard lists among other regionals. Nine librarians reported that they did not favor the proposal. It seems a shame not to exhaust all possibilities in finding a home for these older documents, most of which are out-of-print and otherwise not obtainable. Many newly designated universities are attempting to build up research collections, and in the smaller states it is often difficult to find takers for many valuable old documents. It may be recalled that one significant difference in the New York and Wisconsin experimental plans was that for New York a nationwide survey was to be made for Serial Set volumes not wanted in the state, while other materials had to be offered only within the state (as is the case in the Depository Library Act of 1962). The comments which were added to this question are quite diverse and are listed verbatim in Appendix K without analysis.

Other Disposal Policy

During a visit to a midwestern regional depository in 1972, a question arose which I had not previously considered as a problem and had not included in my 1972 survey. This concerned the legality or propriety for a regional to refuse permission to a selective depository to discard a publication which it had held the mandatory five years, and for which it had submitted its disposal request in accordance with instructions from the regional depository. The subject became more timely when in a draft revision of the Instructions to Depository Libraries dated April 1973 the Superintendent of Documents had added that "the Regional Depository can refuse to grant permission for disposal of any publication that it feels should be kept for a longer period of time by one of its depositories". In the comments which I submitted to the Superintendent of Documents regarding this passage, I remarked that "while I agree in theory and philosophically with this statement, I can't agree with it practically or from a legal point of view". The statement subsequently appeared in Section 2 of the revised Instructions to Depository Libraries with the words "may refuse" substituted for "can refuse"

I feel this statement contradicts that portion of the law (first enacted in 1922) which delegated to the individual depository library the authority to select which items it wanted. This presupposes that the local depository knows best the needs of its local clientelle and of the citizens in the district which it serves, also the limits of its resources to service and maintain a collection. Then by an extension of logic, it should know best which items it wishes to retain after satisfying the mandatory five year retention requirement. By law the regionals are required to provide "assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publicatinns". They are not authorized to determine what a depository should select, or by extension what it should hold.

In response to question 22, only one regional depository reported that it had denied a request by a selective depository to permit it to discard a publication in such a situation. Thirty six reginnal depositories reported they had not denied any request properly submitted. However, eight regional librarians replied that it would be proper for them to do so, while 24 regional librarians felt that this action was not proper. The questionnaire was completed before the revised Instructions had been issued, and most regional librarians were not aware that such a provision had been incorporated into a draft revision of the Instructions. The comment of one regional librarian probably expressed the feeling of many others that while its regional would not refuse permission to discard, it might recommend under certain circumstances that the depository continue to hold the publcations. Another regional librarian commented that "if we feel it is necessary for the depository to retain the documents, then it should be our responsibility (i.e. the regional 's) to find that shelf space, and not their's (i.e. the selective depository's)."

In question 23, I asked "does your regional require selective depositories to select (or maintain) items which they do not desire?" All 37 regionals which responded to this question answered "no". This question was similar to question 22 and was inserted because of the statement in the April 1973 draft of the Instructions to Depository Libraries. One regional librarian commented quite correctly that "we have no power to do that". Another regional librarian added a comment which might be shared by others that its regional had not required a depository to select certain items but had made suggestions in this regard.

My feeling regarding the selective provision is that the law should be changed. There are too many libraries that abuse the depository privilege by selecting too few items to make them a viable depository. The Depository Library Council to the Public Printer is aware of this problem, and has two committees (Standards and Inspections) working on it. In the past, documents librarians have suggested that there should be a minimum number or percentage of items which a depository must select in order to retain its status. The Standards Committee proposed a minimum figure of 25% item selection. I think a more reasonable minimum is 10% (which I proposed in my 1972 report) and for anything between 10-25% the selections of the depository should be evaluated on an individual basis. The Standards Committee has also recommended that in addition there should be a list of basic items which every depository must select, such as the U.S. Code, U.S. Government Manual, and Code of Federal Regulations. I agree fully with this proposal.

In question 24, I asked the regional depositories if they kept statistics of their disposal operations, and if they did to furnish any statistics available. Six libraries reported that they kept such statistics, but the statistics which were furnished did not provide any useful data. Thirty one regionals reported that they do not keep statistics on disposal operations.

In question 25, I asked for comments on other policy and/or problems regarding disposal operations. Since the comments were quite varied, I have extracted and printed them verbatim in Appendix L. Some of them may be of interest to other regional librarians, or may provide some materials for other researchers working on this topic.

VII. INTERLIBRARY LOAN

The Depository Library Act of 1962 requires that regional depositories "within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publications". The placement of the words "for depository libraries" may leave a reasonable doubt whether regional depositories are required to provide interlibrary loan and reference service only to other depositories in their region, or to all libraries and citizens. In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents provides the following interpretation: "Within the region they serve, designated regional depositories must provide interlibrary loan and reference service to designated depository and non-depository libraries". I do not believe this requirement is warranted by a strict interpretation of the law, or the legislative intent as shown in the reports and hearings.

However, as a practical matter regional depositories generally provide interlibrary loan service on government documents to all libraries which normally use the interlibrary loan service of the parent library. As a general rule, the interlibrary loan program for U.S. government documents is integrated with the operations of the Interlibrary Loan Office of the parent library.

In question 26, I asked regional depositories to describe their interlibrary loan operations by indicating on a checklist which office handles certain functions: the Interlibrary Loan (ILL) Office, the Documents Office, or the two Offices in combination. A summary of the response is shown below:

	ILL Off	DOCS Off	Comb.
a. Request from depositories sent to/received by	27	1	10
b. Requests from depositories processed by	22	6	9
c. Requests from non-depositories sent to/received by.	28	1	9
d. Requests from non-depositories processed by	22	5	10
e. Identification, search, retrieval by	6	23	9
f. Mailing of documents by	31	3	2
g. Follow up on overdue documents by	26	3	8

In question 27, I asked what restrictions, if any, are placed on interlibrary loan for clientelle, loan period, type of material and others. With respect to restrictions on clientelle, almost all regionals answered "none", although several provided the obvious answers which are undoubtedly observed by the others: i.e. to libraries only, and provided ALA guidelines are followed.

With respect to restrictions on the loan period, these ranged from one week (1 regional) to a full semester (1 regional). The loan periods reported by the other regionals are as follows: 2 weeks (14 regionals), 3 weeks (5), 4 weeks (5), one month (9), 5 weeks (1), and 6 weeks (1 regional).

With respect to restrictions on materials, the following types of publications were reported: reference works (8 regionals), rare volumes (5), Census materials (4), heavily used (3), current items(2), Congressional Record (2), old serial set volumes (2), any serial set volume (2), statutes (2), U.S. Code (2), and following one mention each: Federal Register, loose leaf publications, small publications which can be copied, easily lost materials, special collection materials, and reserve books. Thus, regional libraries do not believe that the law requires them to loan every depository publication in their collection. They believe that reasonable restrictions can, and should be placed on interlibrary loan, and that these restrictions should be somewhat comparable to those placed on regular library materials in the ALA guidelines. They believe that interlibrary loan should be restricted to older and/or little used materials.

With respect to other interlibrary loan restrictions, seven regionals mentioned "for use in the borrowing library only". However, several remarked this restriction is placed only on certain types of materials which might be loaned, such as "valuable material" or serial set volumes.

The topic of local circulation is closely allied to interlibrary loan. In question 28, I asked if U.S. government documents are circulated locally, and if so what restrictions are placed on such loans. Forty regionals reported that they allow government documents to circulate; three regionals which are academic libraries do not. With respect to restrictions on clientelle, 17 regionals reported no restrictions, other than (I assume) the implied restriction to authorized borrowers of the parent library only. The main restrictions on authorized borrowers in academic libraries is to exclude undergraduate students and to limit loans to staff, faculty, and graduate students. State libraries generally restrict loans to state employees and government agencies. Although none of the public libraries reported any restrictions, it is suspected they probably limit such loans to adult patrons.

With respect to restrictions on the loan period, these ranged from 3 days (1 regional) to 1 semester (3 academic library regionals). The loan periods reported by the other regionals were: 1 week (5 regionals), 2 weeks (14), 3 weeks (4), 4 weeks (5), one month (3), 5 weeks (1), 6 weeks (1), and 8 weeks (1 regional).

The restrictions on circulation of materials are similar to those for interlibrary loan. The following were reported: reference works (17 regionals), Census materials (4), serial set (3), older materials (2),periodicals (2), statutes (2), U.S. Code (2), and the following one mention each: maps, Congressional Record, Federal Register, rare volumes, easily lost materials, heavily used materials, laws, reserve books, and regulations. With respect to other restrictions, one state library reported that it copies excerpts from reference books free for state employees in lieu of lending such books.

In question 29, I asked whether regional depositories collected statistics on interlibrary loan. Twelve reported that they did, and 31 regionals reported that they did not. However, only four regionals provided brief statistics on interlibrary loan operations for the past year.

After two attempts I have been unable to gather any usable statistics to determine how much of an added burden the interlibrary loan provision has placed on regional depositories, and what effect the interlibrary loan provision in combination with the disposal provision has had on the selection policies of regular depositories. It was expected that some depositories would reduce their selections if they were assured they could borrow older and/or little used materials from a regional depository. On the other hand, it was expected that some depositories would increase their selections of medium use items, especially those of topical value, if they could discard them after five years, or after the initial period of heavy use had passed, and be assured they could borrow the publications later if needed for research or historical purposes.

In question 30, I asked for other policy and/or problems regarding interlibrary loan operations. The comments are quite varied, and again I have extracted and printed them verbatim without analysis in Appendix M.

VIII. REFERENCE SERVICE

The Depository Library Act of 1962 requires regional depositories to provide "reference service". In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, Revised July 1974 the Superintendent of Documents stated that such reference service must be provided to designated depository and non-depository libraries. Neither the Act nor implementing Instructions have specifically defined reference service in connection with the added responsibilities of regional depositories. One usually associates "ref[illegible] service" with assistance to individual patrons, rather than t[illegible] libraries. With respect to regional depositories, it appears the emphasis should be placed on "service" rather than on "reference". It has therefore come to mean any additional assistance which the regional depository can furnish within its available resources to the other depositories in its area of responsibility.

When viewed in this context the implementing Instructions provide two examples in Section 2 of such types of assistance which are not specifically mentioned in the Act:

> "A representative from the designated Regional Depository should make periodic visits to the various depository libraries in the State or region in order that they may be familiar with the operations and needs of the depository libraries whom they serve in this capacity".
>
> "Regional depositories in concurrence with the Superintendent of Documents may prepare guidelines and issue any special instructions which they deem necessary for the efficient operation of depositories within their jurisdiction and which will enable the library to better serve the needs of the community where it is situated".

Periodic Visits

The main programs by which regionals provide additional assistance are periodic visits and workshops. Since the Superintendent of Documents had included a question on the 1971 Biennial Survey regarding periodic visits (it did not appear again in 1973), and the April 1973 draft revision of the Instructions to Depository Libraries had included a statement that regional depositories are "expected" to make periodic visits, I included several questions in my survey on this subject.

In question 32, I asked how many depositories a representative from the regional had visited since the library became a regional depository. Twenty seven regionals reported that they had visited at least one selective depository, for a total of 232 depository libraries visited. In three smaller states all of the 17 depository libraries in each had been visited at least once, and in one of these states had been visited twice. In four of the larger states, over twenty depository libraries had been visited at least once in each state.

In response to question 33, twenty five regionals reported that during the past two years they had visited a total of 131 depository

libraries located at the following distances: up to 25 miles - 32; 26-50 miles - 23; 51-100 miles - 26; 101-150 miles - 28; and over 150 miles - 22.

In view of the Superintendent of Documents statement in the April 1973 draft of the Instructions to Depository Libraries that regional depositories are "expected" to make periodic visits (changed to "should make periodic visits" in the July 1974 Revision) I asked in question 34 whether regional depositories should be required to make such periodic visits without being provided financial support from the federal government for the added costs. Thirty one regional librarians replied "no", and only five replied "yes". I also asked for comments on this question. Extracts have been reprinted in Appendix N.

Inspections and Standards

The next three questions on the survey dealt with the related topic of inspections and standards. Many depository librarians have felt for a long time that there should be a crack-down on the large number of depositories who are wasting valuable designations . An Illinois State Library survey in 1971 showed that 9% of the Illinois depositories had selected 10% or less of the items offered,[2] and 44% of them had selected fewer than 25% of the available depository items. These results are similar to the Powell Report of 1956 commissioned by the House committee considering revision of the depository library law.[3] That earlier survey reported that 12% of the depositories had selected fewer than 10% of the available items, and 24% had selected fewer than 25%. Documents librarians have also criticized the Superintendent of Documents for not conducting an active and thorough inspection program, and for not taking more positive action on terminating the status of undeserving depository libraries. The Superintendent of Documents previously had authority and responsibility to conduct inspections, and the Depository Library Act of 1962 codified these into an "inspection" provision as follows:

> "The Superintendent of Documents shall make first hand investigation of conditions for which need is indicated and include the results of investigations in his annual report. When he ascertains that the number of books in a depository library is below ten thousand, other than Government publications, or it has ceased to be maintained so as to be accessible to the public, or that the Government publications which have been furnished the library have not been properly maintained, he shall delete the library from the list of depository libraries if the library fails to correct the unsatisfactory conditions within six months".[4]

Two groups with the same chairman, and some of the same members (ALA Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System, and the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer) have expressed concern about these problems and have made certain recommendations. In its report to the ALA Council in July 1974, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System recommended that regional depositories "should assume the responsibility of conducting periodic inspection

of depository libraries in their areas to insure compliance with national standards", and that they should be provided financial support to perform these and the other additional responsibilities mentioned in the Act. The Depository Library Council to the Public Printer has formed two committees dealing respectively with inspections and standards.[5] The Inspection Committee recommended that the Superintendent of Documents retain the inspection responsibility, and that the GPO inspection team should include a representative from the regional depository and a documents librarian from another depository of the same size and/or type of library as the depository being inspected. Meanwhile, the Superintendent of Documents is finally establishing a formal inspection program. He has created two librarian spaces in the Library and Statutory Distribution Service as depository library inspectors.[6] An inspection team has begun to make unannounced visits. One such visit was made to our regional depository in Maryland. Following that visit subsequent unannounced visits were made to other depository libraries in Maryland; and I was invited to accompany the inspection team as a representative from the regional depository. Unfortunately, they have been "visits" rather than "inspections". Perhaps after the first round of "visits" are made, and the inspectors become more familiar with depository library operations and the Depository Library Council has developed a suitable checklist incorporating minimum standards they may then become "inspections". I would recommend that qualifications for inspectors should include at least five years experience at a depository library with a large separate documents collection.

In view of the recommendations of the ALA Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System, I asked regional librarians in question 35 if they favored transfer of responsibility for inspection of depositories from the Superintendent of Documents to the regional depositories if federal financial support were furnished. Twenty nine regional librarians favored the idea; nine did not. However, the comments which were added (see Appendix M) indicated that those who do not favor the proposition have stronger feelings on the subject.

In view of the activities of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, I asked regional librarians in question 36 if they favored establishment of national standards for depository libraries. Thirty two favored the proposal; five did not. I also furnished them a checklist of items which might be included in such standards as follows: number of personnel (25 favor); qualification of documents personnel (29 favor); minimum number of depository items selected (28 favor); list of specific items required to be selected by all depositories (21 favor).

With respect to the minimum number of items which a depository must select in order to retain depository status, I provided on the survey four options: 10% (4 favor); 20% (1 favors); 25% (20 favor); or other percentage (4 suggestions). Three regional librarians recommended 50% minimum item selection, and one recommended 40%. The Standards Committee of the Depository Library Council has recommended 25% as minimum item selection criteria. It is also developing a list of required items which every depository library should select.

My own recommendation which I made in my earlier report is that the minimum should be 10% item selection, and that for anything between 10-25% the selections of the library should be evaluated to determine if they adequately serve the needs of the depository's area. Thus in question 38, I asked "if the retention of depository status is contingent upon an evaluation of the items selected and maintained by a depository, who should make this evaluation?" Three choices were provided and the response was as follows: regional depository (23 favor), state library agency (5 favor), or GPO (8 favor).

Workshops.

The principal method by which regional depositories provide general assistance to selective depositories is by conducting workshops. In question 39, I asked them if they had conducted or sponsored any workshops, seminars, conferences, or similar events during the preceding two years. Fifteen regionals replied that they had, and 22 regionals had not. Most of these had conducted only one workshop; one regional had conducted two workshops; and two regionals had conducted three workshops each. One state library had conducted a series of 17 workshops throughout the state which were attended by 340 librarians. This library conducted the two types of workshops which are those typically conducted by regional depositories: one for documents specialists, primarily from depository libraries; and the other type for non-specialists, primarily to promote the use of government documents in small public libraries and high school libraries.

The typical one day workshop for depository librarians consists of three parts. In the morning, formal presentations are made by several guest speakers, usually from the participating depositories or from the regional. These are often augmented by a speaker from the Government Printing Office, or from a federal agency concerned with producing or issuing documents available to depositories. In the afternoon the assembly is usually broken down into work groups ("miniworkshops") which discuss specific topics and problem areas, such as selection and acquisition, bibliographic control, interlibrary loan and cooperation, organization, and use and servicing of a documents collection. Each group has a discussion leader, usually from one of the depositories or regional. At the end of the workshop a summary of the major problems discussed by the work groups is prepared and presented to the assembly, often with recommendations for further action. A model example of the typical workshop for federal government documents will be found in the June 1971 issue of Illinois Libraries which is a special issue devoted to the proceedings of a workshop conducted by the Illinois State Library.

Other Assistance

Another excellent way in which a regional can provide assistance to its depositories, particularly to newly designated depositories, concerns selection of depository items. In question 40, I asked regional librarians if they provide such assistance. Sixteen librarians replied that they did, and twenty one replied that they did not. However, an analysis of the comments which were added by many of these librarians

indicated that such assistance is usually provided only if asked, and at least seven librarians specifically commented that they had not been asked. This report is disturbing. On the one hand regional depositories should take a greater initiative in providing this important service. On the other hand, regular depositories should take advantage of the services which regionals are uniquely capable of offering rather than blindly making selections of items. Since regionals are required to accept and retain all items, it would be worthwhile for documents librarians to visit their regional library in order to see first hand the number and types of publications they will get if they select certain items. If the regional is too distant, they should plan to visit the nearest large research library which is a depository. Most research libraries select a high percentage of the available items.

In question 42, I asked regional librarians if they felt the intent of the Depository Library Act was that regional depositories should provide assistance (a) only to other depository libraries in the region, or (b) to all libraries in the area served by the regional. Twenty eight chose the latter or more liberal interpretation of the Act, and only seven (including myself) chose the more strict interpretation. I had included this question since I had the impression from my previous survey and visits that the intent of the Act is interpretated differently by different types of libraries. It appeared to me that state libraries accept the more liberal interpretation as a general rule since they have responsibilities for supporting general library services statewide, and that academic libraries which generally do not have such responsibilities accept a narrower view of the intent of the law. However, two of the seven regional librarians who accept the strict interpretation are from state libraries and the other five librarians are from university libraries.

It subsequently turned out that the Superintendent of Documents also accepts the liberal interpretation. In the Instructions to Depository Libraries, Revised July 1974 he added the statement which had not appeared in the April 1973 draft that regional depositories "must provide interlibrary loan and reference service to designated depository and non-depository libraries". I feel that depositories should serve the citizens and non-depository libraries in their congressional district. In serving these depository libraries the regional depository therefore indirectly serves all citizens and non-depository libraries in those congressional districts that have a designated depository. The problem then is who is responsible for serving the citizens and non-depository libraries in congressional districts without a designated depository library? The principle of federal financial support to depository libraries may be involved here.

In question 42, I asked the regional librarians to indicate what other reference assistance they felt regional libraries should be expected to furnish in accordance with the law. Their comments have been extracted and printed in Appendix P.

IX. FEDERAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT

In the last part of the survey, I again attempted to get some hard data on the costs of maintaining a depository collection, and specifically on the added costs to regional depositories for assuming the additional duties and responsibilities required by law. Again I was not very successful in this attempt. Most libraries do not keep good statistics on their documents operations and costs. As discussed earlier, due to library organization for overall government documents service, it is difficult to isolate the costs associated with acquiring, maintaining, and servicing the depository collection of U.S. government documents. Government documents librarians and units also acquire U.S. government documents from other sources (Documents Expediting Project, purchase, gift, exchange, mailing lists, etc.) and they are often responsible for collections of other government documents as well (local, state, foreign, and international documents) and for related materials (maps, technical reports, legal materials, newspapers, and microforms). It is even more difficult to isolate those costs which are associated directly with assumption of additional responsibilities of a regional depository: how many items/pieces does a regional acquire that it might not if it were selective? how many publications would it discard if it were not required to maintain a permanent collection? how many more interlibrary loan requests does it process due to regional status? and/or what are the costs to process disposal requests?

Legislative History

During the House hearings in 1957 and 1958 on the legislation which culminated in the Depository Library Act of 1962, the subject of federal financial support for regional depositories was brought up repeatedly.[1] Many witnesses testified that a depository library would probably not accept the added regional responsibilities without being provided some financial support from the federal government. The House subcommittee members appeared as receptive to providing such support.[2] However, during the Senate hearings on this legislation in 1962, no mention was made of providing federal financial support to regional depositories. Why?

As originally introduced, the depository library law amendment would have required the regional to accept and retain for a minimum of 20 years two copies of each depository publications.[3] All other depositories would have been required to retain them only 10 years. Witnesses representing the library profession testified that a regional (or research) library would wish to retain most government publications permanently, and the requirement to retain two copies of all depository publications was unnecessary and would force the regionals to provide double the amount of stack space now used.[4] When the revised bill was reintroduced in 1962, it had been changed to provide that a regional would be required to retain only one copy (or microfacsimile), but would have to retain it permanently. Depositories served by a regional could discard publications after five years.[5] Not only had the requirment for a regional to accept and retain two copies of a depository publication been dropped, but a provision was added that the Superin-

tendent of Documents would provide regional depositories "micro-facsimile copies of certain depository publications within the limits of available appropriations". The intent of this provision was that the federal government would provide microcopy substitute of older and/or less used documents (particularly voluminous materials) so that regionals could conserve stack space and reduce their expenses. This was apparently inserted to offset the added costs to regionals for assuming added responsibilities.

However, the Public Printer strongly objected now about his added costs,[6] and influenced the deletion of this provision from the bill. The library representatives made no objections to this deletion, apparently because they had achieved their major goal from the legislation: increased the number of congressional designations from 1 to 2 for each representative and senator. They had also pushed through over the strong objections of the Public Printer the non-GPO publications provisions. Thus a compromise was made. The librarians came out even in their battles with the Public Printer: won one, and lost one. The Public Printer subsequently introduced a microform plan of his own in 1970.[7] This plan, which has not yet been implemented, was discussed in Chapter V. It is concerned only with current, newly published materials, and does not include plans for retrospective filming, or filming of collections of older documents.

Recent Developments

After laying dormant for some years, the issue of federal financial support to the depository library system was raised at the 1972 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago during June 1972 by a leading publisher of indexes and microform editions of federal documents. About the same time I had also discussed the subject of financial support to regional depositories in my earlier report. Several regional librarians had at that time suggested that federal funds should be provided to purchase commercial indexes and other bibliographic services which are not provided by federal agencies.[8]

At the ALA Midwinter Conference in Washington during January 1973, the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) sponsored a resolution which was passed by ALA Council that resulted in the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Financial Support of the Depository Library System. The main purpose of the committee as expressed in its charter is "to investigate the possibility of proposing legislation to provide financial support of the Depository Library System ... and to prepare a report considering the possibility of proposing a revision of the Depository Library Act of 1962, incorporating such criteria as: adequate financial support; provision of more non-GPO materials, consulting services to the depository libraries, and other changes necessary to implement the basic provisions of the 1962 Act".[9]

At the ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas during June 1973, the Committee broadened its scope of activities without getting a change in its charter. It changed its name to delete "financial Support" and called itself the Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System.

The Committee submitted an interim report which asked ALA Council to adopt a resolution "to express concern over the need for adequate financial support for the depository system and review of depository legislation through a letter from the ALA President to the Joint Committee on Printing requesting oversight hearings on these matters".[10]

The report of the Committee was submitted to ALA Council at the Midwinter Conference in Chicago during January 1974. It proposed a grandiose scheme for a National Depository Library with responsibility for providing complete bibliographic control over all government "publications" produced at government expense, and for free depository distribution not only of printed publications produced at government expense, but also "slides, films, machine-readable data files, recordings, maps, audio tapes, and video tapes". The definition of "publications" as used in the report includes these other non-print materials.[11] Discussion and action on the report by ALA Council was postponed.

The same report, slightly modified with editorial improvements, was again submitted to Council at the ALA Annual Conference in New York during July 1974. (reproduced as Appendix C) The report was quickly passed by Council without debate. Why?-considering the massive changes recommended which would be quite expensive? Because of a long string attached to it in the form of added recommendations by the ALA Legislative Committee which requires the Ad Hoc Committee to come up with specifics and hard facts, not just glowing generalities. It requires the Committee to make a comprehensive and detailed study of the existing depository system to substantiate the need for change, to develop estimates of costs to implement the drastic changes recommended, and to cite specific sections of the law which must be changed to implement the recommendations. The Committee had not made such a comprehensive study before submitting its recommendations, and had indulged mainly in "brain-storming", in compiling a "wish-list".

Although the Committee was charged specifically with suggesting revisions to the Depository LibraryAct of 1962 which is codified as chapter 19, Title 44, U.S. Code, it made many recommendations which concern GPO's responsibilities for bibliographic control of federal documents which are contained in chapter 17, Title 44. Its recommendations to provide all types of non-print materials (as well as non-GPO printed publications) through the depository distribution system, and provide bibliographic control over them, would require revision of an unknown number of sections of the U.S. Code affecting the Library of Congress, National Archives, National Technical Information Service, and a large number of other federal agencies. Implementation of its recommendations would also prove expensive to the taxpayers, although the argument might be made (as it is for other worthy causes) that it would be less expensive than a few B-1 Bombers or aircraft carriers. But how many B-1 Bomber or aircraft carrier equivalents can we afford?

With respect to recommending financial support (its primary reason for existence) the Committee did not forget the needs of the

regional depositories. However, it almost forgot completely the depository library system in general, and the regular non-federal libraries in particular. Such libraries would, of course, benefit from the increased availability of a wider range and large numbers of "publications" issued by federal agencies; but the only other benefits for them would be provision of commercial reference tools and indexes (such as CIS indexes) which they presently have to purchase. The Committee also recommended that depository libraries should be provided microform reading equipment within the proposed GPO micropublishing project. GPO had not included such a provision in its plan, and has strongly opposed such a provision. This is hard to understand when one of the main selling points of the plan is the savings to be gained by substituting inexpensive microcopy for expensive hard copy publications.[12] Lack of adequate reading equipment may prevent many depositories from choosing microform copy which they might otherwise do if they were furnished reading equipment by the government.

As mentioned previously, the Committee recommended that regional depositories "should assume the responsibility for conducting periodic inspection of depository libraries in their areas to insure compliance with national standards and should provide advisory services and training programs to local depository libraries requesting them". These responsibilities would be in addition to those prescribed by the present law, although advisory services and training programs might fall under the broad umbrella of "reference service".

However, many documents librarians and others interested in the depository library system feel that the federal government should provide, in addition to free publications, financial support for the maintenance and servicing of depository collections. I agree with this to a limited extent, but not for the reasons generally given by the advocates of federal financial support. They usually argue that depository libraries contribute more resources to the program than the federal government. GPO usually helps this argument when in the annual appropriations hearings it provides Congress with an average cost per depository based only on the added costs for printing the additional depository publications, a modest $3,000 annually per depository.[13] To make comparisons valid, GPO should include mailing and overhead costs. On the other hand, at a recent documents workshop it was reported that one large research library spends $150,000 annually on its documents collection, and average cost of $10,000 per depository per year was reported.[14]

However, this argument has several serious flaws. The depository library system has always been accepted as a cooperative venture between the federal government and the library community. In such a venture, each partner contributes something and in turn gains something of equal value (hopefully) in return. I do not think that libraries are getting short changed on the deal. If most depositories did not get these depository publications free on automatic distribution (i.e. standing order) they would try to obtain most of them one way or another, and at far greater expense than they now incur as depositories. They would not only have to pay for the publications

(if indeed they are available as sales publications, which many depository publications are not), but they would also have added administrative costs to order and process vouchers for sales publications, and to obtain bibliographic and ordering information on these and the many other publications which are not GPO sales publications. Consider the uproar raised when the United Nations proposed reducing the number of depositories in this country. Existing depositories were more than willing to bear the expense of maintaining a depository collection for the privilege of receiving free publications. Research libraries which are not U.N. depositories purchase most U.N. publications on standing order and are envious of their fellow libraries which get the same publications free. There is also the added factor that depository collections, particularly at academic libraries and/or libraries which are not public libraries, are maintained primarily for the use of the library's own clientelle - students and faculty, etc. - rather than for the benefit of the general public. With the recent emphasis on "freedom of information" the federal government, on the other hand, is more than ever interested in providing a convenient means by which it can make its publications available to the public. The existing national library network and resources provide a suitable vehicle for this purpose. Thus, it is willing to provide publications free of charge to a designated group of libraries. I do not think the federal government is getting short-changed either in this cooperative venture.

However, I think that financial support for depository libraries is needed to fulfill the basic purpose of the depository library system: to make documents available to the people, but equally available throughout the country. Considering the preeminence of the academic library in the program, it might appear that its main purpose is to support higher education (certainly meritorious). The authorization for various categories of special designations (i.e. federal libraries, state appellate court libraries, etc.) also serve to dilute the major purpose of the system. At present some districts have five or more depositories libraries, many of these with strong collections. On the other hand, 58 districts have only one depository, and 21 have no depository library. There is also the problem of distance or geographical access to depository libraries. There is a rightful concern about depositories which select too few items to make them viable. Perhaps, they need financial support so that they can develop, maintain, and service a useful collection. I also think any financial support should be provided initially only to public libraries. Hopefully, this may encourage more medium size public libraries to seek depository status, since public libraries best serve the basic purpose of the depository library system.

By his liberal interpretation of the Depository Library Act of 1962 as expressed in the revised Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents has imposed additional requirements on regional depositories which most did not contemplate when they accepted regional status. If regional depositories "should make periodic visits" to the depositories in their region, they should be provided financial support by the federal government to pay for travel expenses, and also to compensate for the time taken away from regular duties by the regional librarians to make these visits.

I subscribe to the philosophy that the basic purpose of the depository library system is to make government documents available free of charge to the American people. Every congressional district is authorized two designations for depository libraries for this very purpose. (I will discount special designations such as state libraries, state appellate court libraries, and land grant college libraries since their basic purpose is open to debate.) Thus, all citizens located in a congressional district which has a depository library which used a representative designation have depository service available to them. By providing backup support to these depositories, the regional depository therefore indirectly serves all citizens in those congressional districts (in the same manner a governor serves all citizens in the state, or the President all citizens in the country). But what about those congressional districts which do not have a depository library with a representative designation? There may, of course, be libraries in those districts with a senatorial designation (unlikely) or a special designation. Who is responsible for serving the citizens and non-depository libraries in these districts? This point was not brought up in the hearings on the Depository Library Act of 1962, and I do not believe that the intent of the Act is for the regional depositories to take up the slack in those districts. If this is the intent of the Act as the interpretation by the Superintendent of Documents implies, then it is an added requirement which had not been expected when libraries assumed regional responsibilities. In that case, regional libraries should be provided financial support to carry out these added responsibilities. I would prefer, however, that if financial support is to provided in this situation, that it would be provided to public libraries in those districts who might otherwise not have been willing or able to assume responsibilities of depository status.

Added Costs for Regionals

In question 43, I asked regional libraries what percent of the available depository items they had selected before their designation as a regional. The response ranged from 75% for three regional depositories to 100% (or "all" depositories) for nine regionals. The average item selection was approximately 90%. In 1972 I had concluded that the requirement for a regional to accept all items did not place too great an added burden on most regionals. From Part II of the survey on retention policy I had also concluded that the requirement for them to retain all depository publications permanently had likewise not placed much of an added burden on regional depositories.

In question 44, I asked regional libraries what items (or types of items) they would not select if they were not a regional, and what they would discard. The response was similar for both parts of the question. Military publications ranked the highest on both parts.

With respect to types of items which they would not select, eight regional librarians mentioned military publications in general, or some specific categories including Army Regulations, Federal Item Identification Guides, DOD Manuals, Army publications, technical manuals, mil-

itary regulations, and military magazines. Other groups of items which were mentioned several times include agricultural and medical publications. One library expressed this by saying the library would probably delete items acquired by the branch libraries (i.e. AEC, medical, agriculture, and legal publications). Legal publications were also mentioned by several others, such as bills, hearings, decisions, and law reprints. Sailing directions were mentioned twice and light lists once. Technical reports and research reports were listed once each. Looseleaf publications were mentioned twice, and one mention each for small pamphlets, addresses, and news releases. One library made a good observation on the GPO microform program saying it would like to delete those types of items which it had selected for microform in lieu of hard copy (i.e. little used materials). Indeed, many of the types of items selected by regionals for the GPO Microform program appear on this list.

The types of items which regionals would like to discard given the opportunity were generally of the same type. Five regionals mentioned publications of the military services. Agricultural publications were mentioned twice, also medical and law once each. "Little used" publications were mentioned twice. Other similar types of publications which were not mentioned in the first part above include: VA and NASA publications, Soil Surveys (except the home state), CFR reprints, and superseded CFR editions, and Civil Service Commission regulations.

In question 45, I asked if since becoming a regional they had increased the number of copies of publications available in order to provide interlibrary loan service. Fourteen replied "yes", and twenty two replied "no". Most of the added comments on this question stated this is done to a very limited extent due mainly to lack of funds, also lack of staff and other resources. A suggestion is frequently made that regional depositories should be allowed to request a second depository copy free on certain items as needed. All depositories from the smallest public library to the largest university library are allowed to receive only one free depository copy of a publication. As noted above, the original legislation which resulted in the 1962 Act would have provided regional depositories with two copies of <u>all</u> depository publications. This was rejected since regional (or research) libraries need duplicate copies selectively, and not on a blanket basis.

In question 46, I asked regional libraries if they had attempted to fill gaps in their collections which they might not have done otherwise if they were not a regional depository. Twenty seven replied "yes", and seven said "no". However, the added comments were confined to two points: seven libraries added that they would attempt to fill these gaps anyway even if they were not a regional; and five regionals added that they attempt to fill gaps mainly through duplicate and exchange lists. The latter comment points up the desireability, and perhaps the need, for a central clearinghouse in which regional depositories and other libraries might exchange discard lists.

In question 47, I asked what additional resources had been added (or expended) due to designation as a regional depository, and which were not due to increases in the number of depository items available and/or normal growth of the collection. Very few regional libraries responded to this question, and the information which was furnished did not provide any significant data. I am forced to conclude from this that regional depositories will have a great deal of difficulty justifying federal financial support, if such support is to be provided only to compensate for additional costs incurred by the assumption of regional responsibilities (as it should be).

Getting data about the funds which regional depositories expend to operate and maintain their documents collection may provide interesting information. But it does not attack the basic problem of the added costs for regional responsibilities. Even a look at the data on personnel staffing and organization for U.S. government documents service as provided in Chapter IV of this report shows the problems involved in even isolating the costs for servicing the depository collection. They also show that some library directors place a high value on their collection and service, and provide more than a reasonable amount of support in the way of staff. On the other hand other library directors do not consider that the assumption of regional responsibilities is a "big deal". They continue to be niggardly in their support to provide even adequate service to the library's own patrons, and least of all to other depositories in the state to whom only the minimum amount of assistance allowed by law is provided. The staffing, for example, of academic libraries ranged from 1-3/4 FTE (full time equivalent) personnel spaces to 7.15 FTE personnel spaces, including librarians, and other assistants.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

1. LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf, Regional Libraries and the Depository Library Act of 1962 (College Park, Md.: The Author, June 1972) (available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service as ED 066 177)
2. Wellington Lewis, "The Reorganization of the Documents Area of the Government Printing Office", Documents to the People, III, no.2 (November 1974), 18-19. (hereafter referred to as "DttP")

CHAPTER II. DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962

1. Public Law 87-579; 76 Stat. 352. Codified as chapter 19, Title 44, U.S. Code.
2. 42 Stat. 436, approved March 20, 1922.
3. 44 U.S.C. 1905.
4. 44 U.S.C. 1907.
5. 44 U.S.C. 1902, 1903.
6. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Revising the Laws Relating to Depository Libraries, 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962, Senate Report 1587 to accompany H.R. 8141, pp. 2, 6-7. (hereafter referred to as "S.Rpt. 87-1587")
7. Ibid., p.7.
8. These were H.R. 10316, 12605, 12606, 12778, and 12933, 92d Congress.
9. These were H.R. 1010, 1780, 3234, and 10415, 93d Congress.
10. 34 Stat. 1014, approved March 1, 1907.
11. These are the American Antiquarian Society Library, Worcester, Massachusetts and the Public Library of the District of Columbia.
12. These were H.R. 10562, 11458, and 11921, 92d Congress.
13. These were H.R. 537 and 1734, 93d Congress.
14. 82 Stat. 1283. Codified as section 1915, Title 44, U.S. Code.
15. House Report 92-1201, and Senate Report 92-255 (to accompany S.2227, 92d Congress)
16. U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on Printing. Government Depository Libraries, 93d Congress, 2d session, revised April 1974.

    All statistics in this report relating to the number and type of depository libraries in 1974 are based on the material in this publication which is revised annually. The September issue of the Monthly Catalog also contains a list of currently designated depository libraries. The JCP list is arranged numerically by congressional district within each state; the Monthly Catalog list is arranged alphabetically by city or town within each state. The JCP list provides information on type of designation used, and date of designation as a depository.
17. 44 U.S.C. 1907.
18. U.S. Superintendent of Documents, Instructions to Depository Libraries, Revised April 1974, p. 9.

    Key passages and sections in the Instructions dealing with regional depositories have been extracted and reproduced as Appendix B.
19. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on House Administration. Hearings. Sale and Distribution of Government Publications by the Superintendent of Documents, 84th Congress, 2d session, 1956, pp. 4-11, 19-20.

20. H.R. 12118, 84th Congress, introduced by Wayne L. Hays, Ohio.
21. American Library Association, Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System, dated 7 July 1974 and Recommendations of the Legislative Committee ... dated 11 July 1974. (Approved by ALA Council, 12 July 1974 as 1973/74 ALA Council Document #75)(Hereafter referred to as "Report of the ALA Ad Hoc Committee")
22. Senate Report 93-1255, p. 34.
23. JCP, Government Depository Libraries, p. 1.
24. Mildred Benson and Signe Otterson, Roster of Federal Libraries (Washington: Georgetown Washington University Medical Center, October 1970), p. iii.
25. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Hearings, Depository Libraries, 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962, pp. 59 and 110. (hereafter referred to as "Senate Hearings, 1962")
26. Ibid., pp. 91-92.
27. Instructions to Depository Libraries, 1974, p. 9.
28. S.Rpt. 87-1587, p. 5.
29. LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf, "The Monthly Catalog and Bibliographic Control of U.S. Government Publications", Drexel Library Quarterly, X, nos. 1-2 (January-April 1974), p. 91.
30. Joe Morehead,"The Government Printing Office and Non-GPO Publications", Government Publications Review, I (Fall 1973), 1-5
32. This history is based on an analysis of testimony by the Superintendent of Documents before the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.
31. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1964, 88th Congress, 1st sess., Report no. 369, 1963, p. 24.
33. DttP, II, no. 2 (February 1974), 6, 10.
34. Senate Hearings, 1962, p. 68.
35. Ibid., p. 71.
36. Ibid., p. 62.
37. Ibid., p. 21.
38. FLC Newsletter, no. 54 (May 1972), p. 3.
39. U.S.Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations, Hearings, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1963, 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962, p. 233.

CHAPTER III. WISCONSIN/NEW YORK EXPERIMENT

1. Benton H. Wilcox, "Streamlining the Depository Libraries", Library Journal, LXXXII (January 15, 1957), 138-140.
2. Letter from Carper W. Buckley, Superintendent of Documents to Benton H. Wilcox, Librarian, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, dated November 23, 1954.
3. William P. Leonard, "The Federal Documents Depository System in New York: a New Approach", New York State Library, Bookmark, XV (April 1956), 153-154.

CHAPTER IV. ORGANIZATION

1. 44 U.S.C. 1912.
2. Instructions to Depository Libraries, p. 8.

3. S.Rpt. 87-1587, pp. 11-12.
4. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on House Administration, Hearings, Revision of Depository Laws, 85th Congress, 1st and 2d sessions, 1958, pp. 11, 40. (hereafter referred to as "House Hearings, 1958")
5. Ibid., pp. 15, 28, 30.

CHAPTER V. RETENTION POLICY AND MICROFORMS

1. U.S. Superintendent of Documents, Public Documents Highlights, no. 4 (June 1974), 2, 4.
2. U.S. Superintendent of Documents, Proposed Government Printing Office Micropublishing Pilot Project, October 10, 1974, p. 3.

CHAPTER VI. DISPOSAL POLICY

1. Instructions to Depository Libraries, p. 13.
2. John L. Andriot, Guide to U.S. Government Publications, 1973 edition (looseleaf), 2 volumes (McLean, Va.: Documents Index, 1973)
3. Daniel W. Lester and Marilyn A. Lester, Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1789-1970: Indexes, 5 volumes (Washington: United States Historical Documents Institute, 1972)
4. Mary Elizabeth Poole, Documents Office Classification, 4th edition, (Washington; United State Historical Documents Institute, 1974)
5. Robert M. Simmons, "Handling Changes in Superintendent of Documents Classification", Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Spring 1971), 241-244.
6. LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf, "In the Mail: More on SUDOCS", LRTS, XVI (Winter 1972), 95-97.

CHAPTER VIII. REFERENCE SERVICE

1. Instructions to Depository Libraries, p. 8.
2. Yuri Nakata, "Profile of Federal Depository Libraries in Illinois", Illinois Libraries LIII (June 1971), 431-437.
3. House Hearings, 1958, pp. 172-180.
The "Powell Report", The Depository Library System-an Examination with Recommendations for Increasing its Effectiveness, was based on returns from 652 depository and non-depository libraries to a questionnaire prepared jointly by the House Subcommittee to Study Federal Printing and Paperwork, Committee on House Administration and the Interdivisional Public Documents Committee, American Library Association. Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian of Duke University (who was then Chairman of the Public Documents Committee) prepared the report together with William R. Pullen, University of North Carolina Library.
4. 44 U.S.C. 1909.
5. Information on the activities of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer is based on my attendance at the open meetings of the Council at the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., October 29 and 30, 1974. Information on the earlier activities of the Council is based on reports made by Council members at meetings of the Government Documents Round Table during ALA Midwinter and Annual Conferences.
6. U.S. Superintendent of Documents, Public Documents Highlights, no. 6 (October 1974), p. 1.

CHAPTER IX. FEDERAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT

1. House Hearings, 1958, pp. 30, 31, 41, 50, 79, 83, 85, 87, 98, 107, 108, 183, 184, 187, 202, and 208.
2. Ibid., pp. 30, 54.
3. H.R. 9196, 85th Congress, section 7 (published in House Hearings, 1958, p. 3)
4. House Hearings, 1958, pp. 55-56.
5. H.R. 8141, 87th Congress, section 9 (published in Senate Hearings, 1962)
6. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 60, 76.
7. Don M. Avedon, "The Federal Government Takes Three Giant Steps for Micrographics", Journal of Micrographics, V (March 1972), 165-166.
8. Schwarzkopf, Regional Libraries and ..., p. 39.
9. DttP, I, no. 3 (May 1973), 3-4.
10. DttP, I, no. 4 ((September 1973), 11.
11. DttP, II, no. 2 (February 1974), 10, 13.
12. Proposed Government Printing Office Micropublishing Pilot Project, p. 10.

U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Appropriations, Hearings, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1973, 92d Congress, 2d session, 1972, p. 302.

13. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations, Hearings, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1975, 93d Congress, 2d session, 1974, p. 393.
14. William Buchanan, "U.S. Historical Documents Institute", Government Publications Review, I (Winter 1973), 201.
15. The two regional depositories with the smallest staff (which includes the University of Maryland Library) do not have a separate documents unit. The two libraries with the largest staff have a separate documents unit.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

Name of library: _____

Address: _____

Name & title of regional depository librarian: _____

_____

PART I - ORGANIZATION

1. Describe your U.S. government documents collection.
   ____ a. Separate. ____ b. Integrated. ____ c. Separate, partially integrated.

2. Give a rough estimate in percentages of the number of titles, and linear feet of shelf space occupied within areas listed below. (ex. Congressional Record is a single title but occupies considerable linear feet of shelf space.)

	Titles	Shelf Space
a. In main separate collection.....	____%	____%
b. Separate collection in branch libraries	____%	____%
c. Integrated into collection of Main Library	____%	____%
d. Integrated into collections of branch libraries.....	____%	____%

3. Describe organization which services the U.S. government documents collection. (Sketch of library organization for documents service would be appreciated)

   ___a. Separate government documents department/division.
   Head reports to _____

   ___b. Separate government documents section.
   Part of _____ Division/Department.

   ___c. Not a separate unit. Personnel responsible for servicing the U.S. government documents collection are assigned to: _____
   _____

4. The unit and/or personnel primarily responsible for servicing the U.S. government documents collection are also responsible for servicing the following collections of government documents and/or related materials:

   ____State documents.
   ____Local documents.
   ____International documents.
   ____Foreign documents.
   ____Maps
   ____Legal materials
   ____Government sponsored technical research reports.
   ____AEC.
   ____NASA.
   ____ERIC.
   ____Microforms of govt. documents.

5. Are U.S. Government documents librarian/unit responsible for:
   a. Receiving and processing shipments of U.S. govts. docs. ___yes ___no
   b. Maintaining holding records (shelf list) for U.S. government documents in separate collection(s)..... ___yes ___no
   c. Providing reference service on U.S. govt docs..... ___yes ___no
   d. Shelf maintenance of documents in separate collection ___yes ___no

6. If answer was "no" to any part of question 5, please indicate unit or personnel responsible and extent of their responsibilities (i.e. is responsibility for servicing separate documents collection divided among two or more units?

_____

_____

7. Please indicate number of personnel assigned to separate documents dept/div (total) with breakdown of personnel responsible for U.S. and other documents. For separate U.S. documents section, or no separate documents unit, complete "U.S. Docs" column only. If part time duty for some personnel, compute for Full Time Equivalent (FTE) using fractions if necessary:

	Total	U.S. Docs	Other Docs
a. Librarian (professional)	_____	_____	_____
b. Library assistants (para-professional).....	_____	_____	_____
c. Student (or similar) assistants).....	_____	_____	_____

8. If other library units or personnel contribute a significant amount of time to servicing the depository collection, indicate FTE or hours per week:

a. Acquisitions Dept. _____
b. Catalog Dept. _____
c. Serials Dept. _____
d. Reference Dept. _____
e. Circulation Dept. _____
f. Stack Dept. _____
g. ILL Dept. _____
h. Other (_____):_____

9. Other comments on organization: _____

_____

II. RETENTION POLICY

10. Do you retain bills and resolutions more than two years beyond the close of a Congress? ____ yes. _____ no.
If yes, holding include: _____ to _____ Congress.

11. Do you get microform of old bills and resolutions? ____ yes. ____ no.
If yes, holding of LC microfilm: _____ to _____ Congress.
holdings of CIS microfiche: _____ to _____ Congress.
other holdings(_____): ____ to ____ Congress.

12. Please indicate holdings of microform for following selected U.S. documents, and your retention policy for hard copy.

	Retain duplicate hard copy			
	all	most	some	none
a. Microprint: Serial Set ___ to ___ Cong.	___	____	____	____
b. Proceedings of Congress: ____ to ____ Cong.	___	____	____	____
c. Federal Register: 19___ to 19____.	___	____	____	____
d. Patent Ofc. Official Gazette:____to_____	___	____	____	____
e. Microprint:Depository pubs 19___to19_____	___	____	____	____

13. Please list significant specific items, or types of items for which you selected microform copy on Part II, Biennial Report of Depository Libraries

_____

_____

14. Other comments on retention policy or GPO microform program: _____

_____

PART III - DISPOSAL POLICY

In his Special Instructions to Regional Depositories dated November 7, 1962 the Superintendent of Documents suggested that as a minimum a request by a selective depository for permission to discard should include "current item number, series title, and approximate extent of holdings".

15. Please indicate whether you require a general or detailed list of holdings on discard requests for the categories or items listed below. (Please furnish instructions to selective depositories if available.)

    a. Numbered publications in series: (ex. BLS Bulletins)
    _____ inclusive numbers, or specific number of the publication(s)
    _____ specific number and title of each publication.
    _____ other (describe): _____

    b. Congressional serial set.
    _____ inclusive numbers, or specific number of the publication(s)
    _____ specific number and title of each publication.
    _____ other (describe): _____

    c. Unnumbered or general publications (which have a Cuttered book number) and numbered publications with complicated numbering system (ex. EPA Water Pollution Control Research Series).
    ____ general list only of approximate holdings (ex. hearings and committee prints, 1957 to 1969, 75 pieces)
    ____ detailed list of specific holdings (i.e. book number, title,
    ____ other (describe): _____

16. After the regional depository has requested (or accepted publications which it wishes to add to its own collection, which depository prepares and/or circulates the offering list of remaining items? ___ regional. ___ selective.

17. Please indicate to whom the offering lists are sent. If sent to more than one category under a or b, please indicate chronological order.

    ___ a. Other depository libraries in the state (or regional area).
    _____ in the local area or congressional district,
    _____ all other depositories in the state (or regional area)
    _____ selected depositories in the state (or regional area)
    _____ other (describe): _____
    b. Non-depository libraries and educational institutions.
    _____ in the local area or congressional district.
    _____ selected libraries and institutions statewide.
    _____ other (describe): _____

18. Are offering lists circulated out-of-state? ____ yes. ____ no.
    If yes, please furnish copy of mailing list(s) if available.

19. Do you favor exchange of discard lists among regionals? ____ yes. ____ no.
    Comment: _____

20. What policy do you use on processing requests for offering list items?
___ a. "First-come-first-served"
___ b. "Some-for-all": cut off date of _____ days to submit requests after which selection is made without regard to date of receipt.
___ c. Other (describe): _____

21. What reimbursement do you (or your selective depositories) normally ask?
___ a. Postage (or shipping) charges only.
___ b. Other (describe): _____

22. If a depository has held publications at least five years, and its request satisfies the regional's listing requirement, has your library refused to allow the selective depository to discard the documents? ___ yes. ___ no.
Do you feel it proper to deny requests under these conditions? ___ yes. ___ no.

23. Does your regional require selective depositories to select (or maintain) items which they do not desire? ___ yes. ___ no.

24. Do you maintain statistics of disposal operations? ___ yes. ___ no.
If yes, please furnish any statistics available.

25. Describe other policy and/or problems regarding disposal: _____
_____

PART IV - INTERLIBRARY LOAN

26. Describe ILL procedures for U.S. documents	ILL Off	Docs Off	Comb.
a. Requests from depositories sent to/received by	____	____	____
b. Requests from depositories processed by	____	____	____
c. Requests from non-depositories sent to/received by.	____	____	____
d. Requests from non-depositories processed by	____	____	____
e. Identification, search, retrieval by	____	____	____
f. Mailing of documents by	____	____	____
g. Follow up on overdue documents by	____	____	____

27. What restrictions, if any, are placed on interlibrary loans for:
a. Clientele: _____
b. Loan period: _____
c. Type of material: _____
d. Other: _____

28. Do you circulate U.S. government documents locally? ___ yes. ___ no.
If yes, what restrictions are placed on such loans for:
a. Clientele: _____
b. Loan period: _____
c. Type of materials: _____
d. Other: _____

29. Do you gather statistics of ILL on government documents? ____ yes. ____ no.
If yes, please furnish any statistics available.

30. Describe other policy and/or problems with ILL: _____
_____

PART V - REFERENCE ASSISTANCE

32. In a draft revision dated April 1973 of the Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents proposed that a "representative from the designated Regional Depository is expected to make periodic visits to various depository libraries in the State or region in order that they may be familiar with the operations of the depository libraries which they serve". How many depositories in your region has a library representative visited since becoming a regional? _____.

33. How many depositories has a regional library representative visited during the past two years: ____ within a 25 mile radius? ____ 26-50 mile radius? _____ 51-100 mile radius: ____ 101-150 mile radius? ____ over 150 miles?

34. Do you believe that regional depositories should be required to make such visits without being provided financial support from the federal government? ____ yes. ____ no. Comment: _____

_____

35. The ALA Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System has recommended that regional depositories "should assume the responsibility for conducting periodic inspection of depository libraries in their areas to insure compliance with national standards". If financial support is furnished by the federal government, do you favor transfer of responsibility for inspection of depository libraries from the Superintendent of Documents to regional depositories to insure compliance with the law? ___ yes. ___ no. Comment _____

36. Do you favor establishment of national standards for depository libraries ___ yes. ___ no. If yes, please check items you feel should be included in such standards.
___ a. Number of personnel. ___ b. Qualifications of documents personnel.
___ c. Minimum number of items selected.
___ d. List(s) of specific required items for all depositories.
___ e. Other (describe): _____

37. If you favor selection of minimum percentage of items to retain depository status, recommend minimum is: ____10%; ____20%; ____25%; other ____%

38. If retention of depository status is contingent upon an evaluation of the items selected and maintained by a depository, indicate who should make this evaluation? _____regional. ____state library agency. ____GPO.

39. Have you conducted or sponsored any workshops, seminars, conference, or similar events for the depositories in your region during the past two years? ___yes. ___no. If yes, please indicate date(s), places, types of events, number of participants, etc. If available, please furnish copies of announcements, schedules, proceedings, other documents.

_____

_____

40. Do you provide assistance to selective depositories in selection of items? ___ yes. ___ no. If yes, please describe type of assistance provided:

_____

41. Do you feel the intent of the Depository Library Act of 1962 is for the regional libraries to provide assistance to:
___ a. Depository libraries only in the region.
___ b. All libraries in the area served by the regional.

42. What other reference assistance do you feel regional libraries should be expected to furnish in accordance with the law? _____
_____

PART VI - FEDERAL SUPPORT

43. What percent of the available items did your depository select before becoming a regional: _____?

44. If you were not a regional, what items (or types of items) would you not select _____
What items (or types of items) would you discard? _____
_____

45. Since becoming a regional have you increased the number of copies available (by purchase or request to agencies for hard copy, or backup microform copy) in order to provide ILL service to other depositories? __yes. __no.
Comment: _____

46. Have you attempted to fill gaps in your collections which you might not otherwise have done? ____ yes. ____ no. Comment: _____
_____

47. What additional resources have you added, or expended due to designation of your library as a regional (and not due to expansion of depository items available, and/or normal growth of the collection)?

a. Personnel: _____
b. Shelf/Stack space: _____
c. Office space: _____
d. Collection: _____
e. ILL services: _____
f. Disposal services: _____
g. Reference services: _____

PART VII - SPECIAL

48. Please describe the division of responsibility between your depository and the other regional depository in the state: _____
_____

49. Please describe the services you provide to the federal libraries in your region which are depositories: _____
_____

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS TO DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES, Revised July 1974

Section 1. General Information Concerning Your Depository Status.

*** Your regional depository receives everything. Depend upon them for seldom used items. ***

Section 2. Regional Depositories.

Libraries designated to be Regional Depositories must already be designated depositories, and signify their interest to be designated a Regional.

Designation as a Regional Depository requires prior approval by the library authority of the State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands. A U.S. Senator, the Resident Commissioner in the case of Puerto Rico, or the Governor in the case of the Virgin Islands, must make the designation.

In addition to fulfilling the requirements for regular depositories, regional depositories must receive and retain at least one copy of all Government publications made available to depositories under the Depository Library Program either in printed or microform copy (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents).

Within the region they serve, designated regional depositories must provide interlibrary loan and reference service to designated depository and non-depository libraries. They must also assist selective non-Federal libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publications as provided by law.

The Depository Act authorizes Regional Depositories to permit selective non-Federal depository libraries within the area or areas served by them, to dispose of Government publications which have been retained for at least five years. However, the Regional Library may refuse to grant permission for disposal of any publication that it feels should be kept by one of its depositories for a longer period of time. Regional depositories in concurrence with the Superintendent of Documents may prepare guidelines and issue any special instructions which they deem necessary for the efficient operation of depositories within their jurisdiction and which will enable the library to better serve the needs of the community where it is situated.

Upon request for permission for disposal of publications, the regional library should ask the depository to prepare a list of the publications, showing the current item number, series title, Superintendent of Documents number, and approximate extent of the holdings to be disposed of. Copies of these lists should be forwarded to the Library Division, Superintendent of Documents in order to indicate on our records that the libraries concerned no longer have the documents. Since, as a Regional Depository you are responsible for interlibrary loan, you may want to check the lists for any publications which may be missing from your own collection.

Selective non-Federal depository libraries should be instructed that disposition of unwanted Government documents should be made in the following prescribed manner. Publications should be first offered to

other depository libraries in the State or States, then to some other library or educational institution in the vicinity or area which would be able to make them available to the public and to which requests might be referred. Failing to find such a recipient after reasonable effort, they may be disposed of in any appropriate manner. However,if such disposition should take the form of sale, either as second-hand books or waste paper, the proceeds with a letter of explanation should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents since all depository publications remain the property of the United States Government.

Regional Depositories also have the authority to instruct regular depository libraries regarding the disposal of publications in the event the library decides to relinquish its depository privilege. This disposal should be made in the same afore-mentioned manner, although depository libraries may keep any publications they desire when the depository privilege is terminated.

It is the policy of the Superintendent of Documents to notify the Regional Depository when a new library in the State or States is added to the official list of designated depositories. In the official capacity of Regional Depository it is your responsibility to notify the new library of your status and give them any necessary information regarding interlibrary loan, reference, and any other services which you can provide, such as advice on making selections.

A representative from the designated Regional Depository should make periodic visits to the various depository libraries in the State or region in order that they may be familiar with the operations and needs of the depository libraries whom they serve in this capacity.

Regional Depository Libraries have no jurisdiction over depository libraries in the various agencies of the Federal Government within the region they serve. Depository libraries within the various Government agencies are responsible only to the Superintendent of Documents.

Section 5. Termination as a Depository Library.

A depository library has the right to relinquish the depository privilege at any time by addressing a letter to the Superintendent of Documents stating that the library no longer wishes to be a depository for U.S. Government publications. If the library is served by a designated Regional Depository the regional library should also be notified of this decision.

*** Upon termination of the depository privilege, either by request or for a cause, the library shall request instructions from the Regional Depository concerning disposition to be made of the depository publications on hand. If the library is not served by a designated Regional Depository, instructions should be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents.

If the library wishes to keep permanently certain publications which were received under the depository program, it may do so in the following manner. A list of these holdings should be submitted to the Regional Depository and/or the Superintendent of Documents if the depository library is not served a designated Regional, with an accompanying statement requesting permanent retention. Each request will be reviewed on an individual basis and the depository library will be advised.

Section 7. Survey of New Items.

*** Regional depositories are not required to return item cards since they automatically receive all material made available under the Depository Program.

*** If your library does not select the item and the library is served by a designated Regional Depository, the regional library should be contacted before disposition of the sample copy is made. If the library is not serviced by a Regional Depository, then the sample copy may be discarded.

Section 8. Amendment of Selections.

*** Many times we receive only a limited number of copies of a publication from a department or agency for depository distribution. These copies are sent to all designated Regional Depositories, then they are also made available to selective depositories through a "special offer" on a first-come, first-served basis.

Section 11. Disposition of Depository Publications.

All depository libraries not served by a designated Regional Depository must retain permanently one copy of all Government publications received through depository distribution, except superseded publications or those issued later in bound form or in microcopy form. Government publications received through sources other than the Depository Program may be disposed of in any manner.

Any publication which is a duplicate copy or has been superseded may be discarded.

Those received later in bound form and those for which microform copies have been substituted should be offered first to some other depository library in the State, then to some public library, or educational institution in your vicinity or area which might find use for them. Failing to find such a recipient after reasonable effort, you may dispose of them in any appropriate manner, but should such disposition take the form of sale, either as secondhand books or as waste paper, the proceeds with a letter of explanation should be sent to the Library Division, Superintendent of Documents, as all depository publications remain the property of the United States Government.

Depository libraries within executive departments and independent agencies may dispose of unwanted publications received under the Depository Program, after first offering them to the Library of Congress and the National Archives.

Depository libraries within the State Appellate Courts may dispose of unwanted Government publications after offering them to the designated Regional Depository Library serving the State. If the State is not served by a designated Regional Depository, publications should be offered to the State Librarian.

Depository libraries which are served by a designated Regional Depository may dispose of any publications which they have retained at least five years, after obtaining permission and receiving instructions for such disposition from the Regional Depository which has been designated to serve the area. (See Section 2, paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 for additional information). ***

Below are listed some of the types of material which may be disposed of by all libraries:

1. Daily Congressional Record, after bound volumes are received.
2. Slip laws, after bound Statutes at Large are received.
3. House and Senate bills and resolutions, one year after the adjournment of Congress.
4. Any materials which are cumulated in later issues, such as Supplement to the United States Code, the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, Digest of Public General Bills, Internal Revenue Bulletin (providing the library has selected the item number for the Cumulative Bulletin), and only after cumulation is received.
5. Any publication upon receipt of a revised edition.
6. Pages from looseleaf publications that are replaced by new pages.
7. Separates, upon receipt of final bound volumes.
8. Senate and House reports and documents upon receipt of the serial set volumes.
9. Lists and indexes of publications of various agencies, upon receipt of complete new editions, (e.g. list of publications of the Bureau of Mines, indexes of Congressional committee hearings issued by the Senate Library, etc.). Small spot lists, such as publication announcements, may be discarded at the end of six months or when they have lost their timeliness.
10. Annual or biennial publications of a statistical nature which merely revise figures or information and bring them up-to-date, such as Index of Specifications and Standards, Light Lists, etc., upon receipt of a new issue. This permission does not apply to annual publications such as annual reports of departments and agencies, each of which covers the activities of the organization for a specific period of time.
11. Material which has an expiring effect date, such as Civil Service examination announcements. On such material only the latest issues need be kept.
12. Any publication which is superseded by another which is stated to contain similar information.
13. Calendar of the House of Representatives, upon receipt of a new issue. However, the Monday issues contain an index while the other issues do not. The final issue of each session of Congress should be kept. All issues of the Senate Calendar must be retained since this publication is not cumulative.

Section 12. Substitution of Microcopies for Depository Publications.

Permission is granted to all designated depositories to substitute microcopies for any holdings of U.S. Government publications, provided the microcopies are properly referenced, can be readily located, and are easily accessible to users. Proper reading equipment must also be available for whichever type of microcopy is substituted for the original.

Libraries availing themselves of this allowance for substitution should send a list of the material for which microcopies have been substituted to the Library Division, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402. If the library is served by a designated Regional Depository, your regional library should be notified of this action in order to assist you in the disposal of any unwanted paper copies, and they in turn will forward a copy to the Superintendent of Documents with annotations as to action taken.

1973/74 ALA Council
Document #75

APPENDIX-C

Report of the
Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System

The ALA Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System recommends that:

1. To insure that all citizens have optimal access to information published by the federal government, the present depository library system should be strengthened and expanded into a comprehensive network of local and regional depositories, with a national depository agency at the head of the system.

2. The national depository agency should provide complete bibliographic information on all publications produced at the expense of the federal government. These bibliographic data should be made available to the depository library network, to libraries in general, and to any other regional or national library network.

3. "Publications" shall be defined as all print and non-print documents produced at the expense of the federal government, regardless of format, method of reproduction, or source. These documents shall include, but not be limited to, printed documents, slides, films, machine-readable data files, recordings, maps, audiotapes and videotapes.

4. A comprehensive and historical collection of federal publications should be maintained by the national depository agency as a permanent archive for reference and photocopy services for depository libraries and for the general public.

5. A permanent Council on Depository Libraries should be established to consult with the national depository agency on all aspects of the depository library system. The Council should include documents librarians, federal printing officials, and representatives of library associations and of the federal library community.

6. The national depository agency, in conjunction with the Council on Depository Libraries, should be authorized to designate additional depositories based on each library's demonstrated need and ability to meet national depository standards. Before a library could achieve depository status in this matter, it must obtain the approval of the regional depository library and the appropriate state library agency. Present provisions for designating depository status would not be affected.

7. National standards of performance which all depository libraries must meet to obtain or continue depository status should be established by the Council on Depository Libraries and administered by the national depository agency.

8. Regional depositories should continue to be charged with (a) receiving and retaining at least one copy of all federal government publications made available to depositories, and (b) providing local depository libraries with interlibrary loan service, reference service, and assistance in the disposal of unwanted documents. In addition, regional depository libraries should assume the responsibility for conducting periodic inspection of depository libraries in their areas to insure compliance with national standards and should provide advisory services and training programs to local depository libraries requesting them.

In order to carry out their responsibilities, regional depositories should be provided with federal funds, on a formula bases, which should include such factors as number of libraries in the region, types of libraries in the region, distances involved, and actual dollars expended in performing legal responsibilities.

9. Depository libraries should be offered, at the expense of the federal government, the following:

a. All publications as defined in #3 above. Exceptions should include: (1) security classified documents (available when declassified) and (2) publications produced for obvious internal office use. An option should be given to depository libraries to receive documents in paper or microform, where publications are available in both forms.

b. Reference tools, including adequate indexes designed to be used with federal documents. These should include quasi-official and commercial publications essential to the operation of a depository library. The selection of the tools should be made by the depositories from a list compiled by the national depository agency in conjunction with the Council of Depository Libraries.

c. Equipment needed to insure easy and efficient access to publications in microform.

10. Adequate guidelines should be established by the national depository agency in conjunction with the Council to govern the provision of items to be offered to depository libraries.

11. The national depository agency should also handle the distribution of U.S. government publications to other countries which provide sets of their documents to the Library of Congress on an exchange basis.

12. The American Library Association should transmit this report to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The ALA Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System consisting of representation from Council and four units (ACRL Law and Political Science Section, the Interdivisional Committee on Public Documents, the Government Documents Round Table, and the Legislation Committee) recommends that it be continued by the ALA Council to serve as a working committee to further develop the implementation of these proposals.

Ad Hoc Committee Members

Joyce Ball
C. Edwin Dowlin
Nathan R. Einhorn
Judy Fair
Dan F. Henke
Bernadine Hoduski
Marilyn A. Lester
Lois Mills
Ralph E. McCoy, Chairman

7 July 1974

* * *

Recommendations of the Legislation Committee on the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System

The Legislation Committee has reviewed the attached report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System and agrees with the statement as incorporating the principles of much-needed reform in the federal depository system.

The legislation Committee recognizes the extreme complexity of the problems of the depository system and recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee be continued and given the following assignments:

1. developing and collecting comprehensive data on the existing depository system to substantiate the need for change

2. developing an estimate of costs for implementing the changes recommended

3. analyzing the data collected and recommending specific changes in existing statutes as a basis for legislative action

4. communicating with other units of ALA, including the state chapters,to enlist their ideas and aid in support of an improved depository system as outlined in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Legislation Committee further recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee report to the Legislation Committee on its progress in accomplishing the tasks specified above.

11 July 1974

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
Washington, D.C.

June 2, 1953

TO ALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Recent legislation enacted by the State of Wisconsin provides for the establishment and operation of a central state depository and loan collection of Federal documents for the benefit of the State University, the State Law Library, the State Colleges, and such other college, depository and public libraries in the State as may from time to time participate in this depository program. The central depository and loan collection will be located in Madison, the State Capital, and the present collections of the State Historical Society and the University of Wisconsin will form the nucleus of the central collection.

It is anticipated that this plan will provide a central source within the State of Wisconsin from which participating libraries can obtain on loan the less-used Government documents in the depository series and that the depository libraries in Wisconsin will, as a result, be able to make a considerable reduction in the number of items which it has been necessary for them to select heretofore under the depository privilege.

It will be possible for participating depository libraries to obtain permission from this Office to make a general transfer to the central collection of all depository documents in their collections which are more than twenty-five years old. The granting of permission for this disposition is contingent upon the deletion from the depository selection of a substantial number of the items which the libraries are now selecting. Requests to dispose of all depository documents more than 25 years old should be submitted to this Office with requests for amendment of the depository selections. The documents to be disposed of need not be specifically listed in this case.

In unusual instances, a depository may receive permission from this Office to transfer to the central collection a Government document less than 25 years old, if such document is little used and unwanted by the library which has selected it. Permission for this disposition will not be granted unless the depository has requested the deletion from its depository selection of the item number under which the publication in question was distributed to depository libraries and request for the disposition of documents in this category must list the specific documents in question.

Attention is invited to the fact that all publications distributed by this Office under the depository privilege remain the property of the United States Government. Duplicate copies of depository publications transferred to the central collection and not needed there may be disposed of by the central collection by gift to some other library or institution, or otherwise as desired. In the event, however, that this disposition takes the form of sale, the proceeds thereof must be turned over to this Office accompanied by a letter of explanation in order that they can be deposited in the U.S. Treasury. The same requirement is applicable to individual depository libraries which have received permission to dispose of a document which is not desired by the central collection.

It is hoped that these exceptions to the depository regulations, which are applicable only to depository libraries in the State of Wisconsin which are participating in the program of the central loan collection, will be a means of relieving some of the critical space problems and other difficulties which those libraries are now faced.

s/Roy B. Eastin
t/ROY B. EASTIN
Superintendent of Documents

APPENDIX E

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
Washington 25, D.C.

February 15, 1956

TO ALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK
(exclusive of New York City)

The New York State Library at Albany has proposed acting as a central depository for publications of the Federal Government and making its collection available for loan purposes to all public and educational institution depository libraries in the State of New York with the exception of those located in New York City. Complete agreement has been reached by the State Librarian and this Office regarding the conditions under which such a program will operate. You will receive from the State Librarian, along with this official notice, details of the plan.

It is anticipated that this plan will provide a central source within the State of New York from which participating libraries can obtain on loan the less-used Government publications in the depository series and that the depository libraries in New York will, as a result, be able to make a considerable reduction in the number of items which it has been necessary for them to select heretofore under the depository privilege.

It will be possible for participating depository libraries to make a general transfer to the central collection of all depository publications in their collections which are more than twenty-five years old. The New York State Library is hereby granted permission to coordinate the disposition, under the terms of its agreement with this Office, of all publications older than twenty-five years which are not needed for its central depository and loan collection, and all depositories participating in the program are authorized to cooperate with the New York State Library in this effort.

In unusual instances, a depository may receive permission from this Office to transfer to the central collection a Government document less than twenty-five years old, if such document is little used and unwanted by the Library which has selected it. Permission for this disposition will not be granted unless the depository has requested the deletion from its depository selection of the current item number of the series under which the publication in question was distributed to depository libraries, and requests for the disposition of documents in this category must list the specific documents in question.

February 15, 1956

Attention is invited to the fact that all publications distributed by this Office under the depository privilege remain the property of the U.S. Government. Duplicate copies of depository publications transferred to the Central collection and not needed there may be disposed of by the central collection by gift to some other library or institution, or otherwise as desired. In the event, however, that this disposition takes the form of sale, either as publications or as waste paper, the proceeds thereof must be turned over to this Office accompanied by a letter of explanation in order that they can be deposited in the U.S. Treasury. The same requirement is applicable to individual depository libraries which have received permission to dispose of a publication which is not desired by the central collection.

It is hoped that these exceptions to the depository regulations, which are applicable only to depository libraries in the State of New York which are participating in the program of the central loan collection, will be a means of relieving some of the critical space problems and other difficulties with which those libraries are now faced.

s/Carper W. Buckley
t/CARPER W. BUCKLEY
Superintendent of Documents

APPENDIX F

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
Washington 25, D.C.

November 7, 1962

Special Instructions to Regional Depositories

Disposition of Publications by Depositories

Depository libraries served by regional depositories have the right to request your permission to dispose of depository publications which they have kept for five years. Upon request for such permission we suggest you ask for a list of the publications showing the current item number, series title, and approximate extent of the holdings for which permission is requested. You may want to check the lists for any materials missing from your own collection or to help other libraries fill in voids.

We would appreciate your forwarding these lists (or a copy of them) to this Office so that we may mark our records to show that the libraries concerned no longer have these materials. This will be helpful in referring requests for out-of-print publications as we often refer such requests to the nearest depository library which our records show received them.

In the actual disposition of other than ephemeral publications we suggest you instruct them along the following lines:

That the publications be offered to some other public library or educational institution in their vicinity which would be able to make them available to the public and to which they might refer requests for their use. Failing to find such a taker after reasonable effort they may dispose of them in any appropriate manner but should such disposition take the form of sale, either as secondhand books or as waste paper, the proceeds with a letter of explanation should be sent to this Office as all depository publications remain the property of the United States Government.

s/Carper W. Buckley
t/CARPER W. BUCKLEY
Superintendent of Documents

APPENDIX G
REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES WITH DATE OF DESIGNATION

ALABAMA-University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa (May 10, 1965)
ARIZONA-Arizona State Library, Phoenix (January 22, 1964)
-University of Arizona, Tucson (January 17, 1964)
CALIFORNIA-California State Library, Sacramento (October 3, 1962)
COLORADO-University of Colorado, Boulder (April 1, 1963)
-Denver Public Library (April 1, 1963)
CONNECTICUT-Connecticut State Library, Hartford (September 26, 1962)
FLORIDA-University of Florida, Gainesville (January 24, 1963)
IDAHO-University of Idaho, Moscow (August 6, 1963)
ILLINOIS-Illinois State Library, Springfield (March 8, 1963)
INDIANA-Indiana State Library, Indianapolis (July 30, 1963)
IOWA-University of Iowa, Iowa City (July 25, 1963)
KENTUCKY-University of Kentucky, Lexington (February 14, 1967)
LOUISIANA-Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge (February 26, 1964)
-Louisiana Tech University, Ruston (February 25, 1964)
MAINE-University of Maine, Orono (December 3, 1963)
NOTE: also serves depositories in NEW HAMPSHIRE and VERMONT
MARYLAND-University of Maryland, College Park (June 29, 1965)
MASSACHUSETTS-Boston Public Library (June 16, 1971)
NOTE: formerly served by Massachusetts State Library
MICHIGAN-Michigan State Library, Lansing (January 31, 1964)
-Detroit Public Library (April 22, 1964)
MINNESOTA-University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (May 2, 1963)
MONTANA-University of Montana, Missoula (January 6, 1965)
NEBRASKA-Nebraska Publications Clearinghouse, Lincoln (July 8, 1974)
NEVADA-University of Nevada, Reno (March 5, 1963)
NEW JERSEY-Newark Public Library (October 31, 1963)
NEW MEXICO-New Mexico StateLibrary, Santa Fe (October 9, 1962)
-University of New Mexico, Albuquerque (December 28, 1967)
NEW YORK-New York State Library, Albany (November 14, 1963)
NORTH CAROLINA-University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (Aug. 20,1963)
NORTH DAKOTA-North Dakota State University, Fargo (March 3, 1969)
NOTE: in cooperation with University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
OHIO-Ohio State Library, Columbus (September 25, 1962)
OKLAHOMA-Oklahoma State Library, Oklahoma City (December 18, 1962)
OREGON-Portland State University, Portland (March 7, 1972)
PENNSYLVANIA-State Library of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg (Aug. 13, 1968)
TEXAS-Texas State Library, Austin (February 21, 1963)
-Texas Tech University, Lubbock (February 21, 1963)
UTAH-Utah State University, Logan (May 9, 1963)
VIRGINIA-University of Virginia, Charlottesville (August 1, 1969)
WASHINGTON-Washington State Library, Olympia (May 10, 1965)
WEST VIRGINIA-West Virginia University, Morgantown (Jan. 28, 1964)
WISCONSIN-Milwaukee Public Library (April 9, 1963)
-State Historical Society, Madison (October 9, 1962)
NOTE: in cooperation with University of Wisconsin,Madison
WYOMING-Wyoming State Library, Cheyenne (August 7, 1974)
NOTE: served by Denver Public Library from 1972-1974

APPENDIX H

REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE REPONSES

	Film	Paper
*University of Alabama	373	2439
Arizona State Library	1080	1732
*University of Arizona	1010	1802
California State Library	328	2484
Denver Public Library	718	2094
*University of Colorado		
Connecticut State Library	60	2752
University of Florida	192	2620
*University of Idaho	1849	963
*Illinois State Library	26	2786
Indiana State Library	0	2812
*University of Iowa	1311	1501
University of Kentucky	661	2151
Louisiana State University	222	2590
Louisiana Tech University	0	2812
University of Maryland	88	2724
Boston Public Library	0	2812
*Michigan State Library	1273	1539
Detroit Public Library	26	2786
*University of Minnesota	1246	1566
*University of Montana	1124	1688
University of Nevada	9	2803
Newark Public Library	936	1876
University of New Mexico	1176	1636
New Mexico State Library	682	2130
*University of North Carolina	1036	1776
*North Dakota State University	1591	1221
*Ohio State Library	734	2078
*State Library of Pennsylvania	1182	1630
Texas State Library	233	2579
Texas Tech University	646	1266
*University of Virginia	1486	1326
Wisconsin State Historical Society	67	2745

*participating in GPO Micropublishing Pilot Project;
also the following non-regional depository libraries:

University of California at Los Angeles
Pennsylvania State University, University Park
University of Northern Colorado, Greely
Indiana-Purdue University Regional Campus Library, Fort Wayne
Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.
Geauga County Public Library, Chardon, Ohio
Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

APPENDIX I - NUMBER OF DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES AS OF APRIL 1974

	Academic				Pub	State		Exec	Ind		Vacancies	
	Univ	Coll	J.C.	LawS	Lib	Lib	Spec	Dept	Agy	TOTAL	Sen	Rep
Ala.	9	5	3	1	3	2	-	1	-	24	-	-
Alaska	3	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	2	1
Ariz.	3	2	1	-	3	1	-	-	-	10	1	3
Ark.	5	8	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	15	-	1
Calif.	20	19	-	3	40	2	4	2	1	91	-	13
Colo.	4	6	1	-	3	1	-	2	1	18	-	4
Conn.	4	5	-	-	5	1	2	1	-	18	-	1
Del.	1	1	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	7	1	1
D.C.	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	16	7	26	-	1
Fla.	14	3	2	-	10	1	-	-	-	30	-	8
Ga.	6	8	2	1	5	1	-	-	-	23	-	3
Hawaii	2	2	1	-	3	2	1	-	-	11	-	-
Idaho	2	4	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	9	-	1
Ill.	15	12	1	2	11	1	1	-	-	43	-	15
Ind.	14	7	-	1	7	1	-	-	-	30	-	1
Iowa	4	5	1	2	5	1	-	-	-	18	-	2
Kan.	5	4	1	2	1	2	-	-	-	15	-	1
Ky.	7	6	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	18	-	3
La.	15	2	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	22	1	2
Maine	1	5	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	11	-	-
Md.	4	5	1	1	2	1	-	2	1	17	1	7
Mass.	8	9	-	-	9	1	2	-	-	29	-	6
Mich.	10	11	2	2	15	2	1	-	1	44	-	5
Minn.	4	8	-	-	7	2	-	-	-	21	-	2
Miss.	3	4	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	10	2	5
Mo.	7	11	-	1	4	2	-	-	1	26	-	3
Mont.	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	2	2
Neb.	3	5	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	12	-	-
Nev.	2	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	6	3	-
N.H.	1	4	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	9	-	1
N.J.	8	7	2	-	16	1	-	-	-	34	-	6
N.M.	6	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	10	-	-
N.Y.	18	31	2	1	16	1	1	2	-	72	-	24
No.Car.	15	11	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	32	-	1
No.Dak.	2	3	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	10	-	-
Ohio	18	16	-	1	14	2	-	-	-	51	-	9
Okla.	7	6	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	18	-	4
Ore.	5	6	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	15	-	3
Pa.	8	19	3	1	15	1	-	1	1	49	-	12
R.I.	2	2	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	9	-	2
So.Car.	4	10	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	18	-	1
So.Dak.	2	5	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	10	-	-
Tenn.	11	4	2	1	4	1	-	-	-	23	1	-
Tex.	28	10	3	1	8	2	-	-	-	52	-	7
Utah	4	3	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	10	-	-
Vermont	2	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	8	-	-
Va.	6	11	3	1	3	2	-	3	1	30	-	5
Wash.	3	5	-	1	6	1	-	-	-	16	1	4
W.Va.	2	8	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	13	-	2
Wisc.	12	4	-	-	7	3	1	-	1	28	-	2
Wyo.	1	3	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	7	1	-
Terr.	3	1	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	8	-	-
TOTAL:	346	334	35	30	261	78	15	33	16	1148	17	175
		(745)	65%		23%	7%	1%	(49)	4%		(192)	

APPENDIX J - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 14

14. Other comments on retention policy or GPO microform program:

-We do not have the money or staff to operate readers on a large scale for microform materials.
-As soon as better indexes are produced, we'll select more on microform. We especially need a good government periodicals index.
-Regional depositories should have the privilege of receiving both microforms and hard copy of the same title. We need hard copy for current use and for circulation when demand is heavy. After demand has lessened we would dispose of the hard copy and retain microform.
-Would definitely like option of getting some current materials on paper and getting microfiche for permanent storage. Would ease circulation and storage problems. Especially helpful for general publications which we must keep but get little use after current need is gone.
-Have asked clarification on time of distribution of single issues.
-We do not have microform program yet. Some microprint copies of earlier Serial Set were obtained to fill in the gaps. We do not have a separate budget to make extensive purchases. The only items we purchase are to replace the missing items of hard copy.
-Would like to see both print and microform offered to regional depositories instead of either/or policy.
-Would like Congressional Record Index in hard copy and other volumes in microfiche. Same is true of similar items.
-Need hard copy for regional use.
-Prefer to keep paper copy.-
-GPO should offer free copy for backfile microform substitution.
-We retain all publications in hard copy.
-Our regional depository serves primarily public libraries and state government agencies, and few of these have equipment to read microfiche. Since we serve the people of the state more often through interlibrary loan, the cost of print-outs for each request would not be feasible for us.
-We would not keep any hard copy at all that had been replaced by microform.
-GPO microform program is a step in the right direction.
-Would like to replace considerably more with microforms, but it is expensive.
-We are the main resource for small libraries throughout the state. They do not have readers,are not likely to for some time.
-I have virtually no use for the current program. It is poorly concieved and I have complained to GPO.
-If the choice is either microform or hard copy we will retain the hard copy.
-The GPO program has not yet said what size fiche they intend to use, and we feel this is important to know before choosing fiche substitutes. We would like more things in microfiche, but need publications in hard copy for current usage, and we cannot afford to buy the fiche additionally.
-As we are a regional, we chose very few, basically those series which receive little use. When program begins, we may change our mind.

APPENDIX K - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 19

19. Do you favor exchange of discard lists among regionals? Comment:

-It is too much work to compile the lists with our limited staff and funds. If there should be Federal financial support to regionals, this would be one of the tasks that could be done.
-My only regret is not being able to circulate other lists to my state's depositories. The chief reason being that the lists are usually not copy-able. So I forward my copy (after I'm done with it) to the library that I know is more zealous about obtaining retrospective docs.
-Regionals have the responsibility of maintaining the most complete collection possible. It is entirely possible for libraries in one region to have surplus of some which another regional has been unable to procure. Therefore an exchange between regionals could help fill gaps in each other's collections.
-No library would discard the kinds of publications which we need.
-Usually selective depositories do not have the money or time to send either the lists or shipments out-of-state. Also, there are enough new selective depositories to take care of most of the discards of older libraries in our area.
-They are the libraries most likely to want duplicates of older documents.
-It would be helpful in filling in gaps.
-Good method of completing retrospective collections.
-Nice, but don't know if time available to compile intelligent organized lists.
-It takes staff- clerical help. We do not have these in order to contribute our share in such a program.
-We don't even have the time or staff to check discard lists sent by out-of-state depositories and I suspect other regionals couldn't cope either.
-I think it would also help us to have a standardized format.
-This probably would not benefit us since the publications we need are very old and not likely to turn up on discard lists.
-Not on a wholesale basis. Too time consuming on both ends. I do feel a need for coordination on a national or regional basis of exchange lists. We distribute our duplicate lists outside the state; it is extremely time consuming although response seems to justify it. If U.S. Book Exchange could be persuaded to list documents by SuDocs class number would this be a possible means of expediting exchange?
-Cost heavy, but would add name if asked. I do not consider blanket distribution worthwhile. Libraries with "integrated collections" cannot check lists easily. This is a strong reason for using SuDocs numbers at regionals. Best success with post World War II large universities which use SuDocs numbers.
-I believe it's more important for regionals to service that state's needs than to help regionals and others in same state with duplicates. It would be valuable to have regionals in as many states as possible with as comprehensive collections as possible.

APPENDIX L - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 25

25. Describe other policy and/or problems regarding disposal:

-Most libraries send us their unwanted items (at their expense) and we try to find an appropriate home for the documents.
-Very few libraries in our region seem to discard things worth the time it takes to process the lists.
-Very time consuming to check lists. We are currently short of staff. We don't have anyone to actually check our shelves to see if our holdings reflect reality.
-We recently had to take 250 volumes of Patent Office specifications from the --- Public Library to supplement our holdings. Finding room for them will be difficult to say the least. We have many similar items we have had to accept - still in boxes. No staff to unpack or add to our collection.
-Five year retention period may be longer than necessary. It should be waived if the library is no longer receiving the items.
-Urge selective depositories to cut down acquisitions to suit their needs and ability to maintain.
-In addition to disposal list we add to it all "duplicates" we as a regional receive. We take any U.S. documents any non-depository library wants to discard and add to our list, as well as state documents.
-Maintain master copies of all weeding lists submitted.
-People tend to forget to refund postage.
-On occasion we handle the return of documents to Washington.
-We are the only non-academic depository in the state other than the Supreme Court Library, so normally the universities contact each other when disposal of documents is necessary.
-Do not have enough staff for proper handling of disposal policy.
-Problem with selective depositories remembering what to do with disposal. Some forget to clear with us, or do not notify us until after they already sent their list out.
-The Instructions to Depository Libraries are not clear in Section 11.
-Unwanted federal documents left after all requests are filled are sent to the U.S. Book Exchange, if desired by that institution.

APPENDIX M - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 30

30. Describe other policy and/or problems with ILL:

-Since we are a fairly new depository, we do not have the older documents people request from ILL. The State Library has a large documents collection and the public libraries all go to them at first.
-Worst problem is garbled, incorrect citations, incomplete citations, etc., requiring lots of time to straighten them out.
-Borrowing and lending microform.
-Many times ILL Office receives a request for material which is in the Documents Section but which they fail to recognize as document material.
-Obtaining documents that are not depository items on interlibrary loan.
-Statistics sometime mix documents and books.
-ILL Office sometimes doesn't recognize a request as being a document.
-Verification often difficult.
-Local public libraries do not always follow the restrictions placed on documents circulation. Lost items usually were replaced through our budget funds.
-Requests sometime come directly to Documents Department by phone or letter. Public libraries are expected to route their requests to the ILL Office through the State Library. Academic and business libraries may request directly from ILL Office.
-Documents Section gets many odd subject requests. ILL Office does not have material for good promotion of documents. Would like to impose stricter requirement for interlibrary loan of serial set volumes.
-The question of circulation of basic reference sets is a problem. We feel we must have them for use, and some of the patrons of remote public and academic libraries cannot get into the city. This problem is aggravated in large and sparsely populated states.
-Sketchy information on author and title requests. If the Monthly Catalog listed more of the output of government agencies it would be easier for libraries to verify requests.
-ILL Office is very short-staffed, and we often have to lend them a student assistant or library assistant. They, naturally, have priority.

APPENDIX N - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 34

34. Do you believe that regional depositories should be required to make such visits without being provided financial support from the federal government? Yes___ No___. Comment:

-Yes. However, financial help would facilitate this. Also we are very busy here. It is hard to find time to do this sort of thing. We would like to make more of it.
-Not feasible. We have only eight depositories, but the nearest is 62 miles away and the average distance is 220 miles. GPO would have to subsidize. Good idea, though; and we try to visit them when a library meeting is at the same location.
-By law (at least originally) this is the job of the Superintendent of Documents. Therefore our employer would not furnish us the time or money for a project of this kind.
-No. Feel federal support not advisable.
-Yes. I think financial support from the federal government would help, but I also believe that the institution which agrees to be a regional depository should accept some of the responsibility.
-Lack of staff and money makes this impossible. Financial support should be provided.
-I don't know if the government will provide support, but I think these visits are important to the depository system. A regional should take its responsibilities seriously.
-We do not have sufficient staff to maintain collection and also visit.
-It puts a financial burden on the Regional in terms of staff and travel money. Regionals receive no privileges not also available to selectives, and accept considerable obligations as it is.
-Regionals might resist being regionals. What rewards? Some prestige, sense of value to library community, etc.
-Ours is a small state, and it's not really necessary since I can use a state car. I believe larger states should get reimbursement for travel expenses. But this is not the area I see as most necessary for funds.
-I know of no requirement that we make trips. Our library could not accept such a responsbility.
-Restricted institutional travel budgets require visits to be tied in with other business, thus not always most direct consideration given.
-No travel funds available locally for such visits, and not likely to be.
-Staff shortages and budget restrictions prohibit.
-Travel funds are very limited and at times almost non-existent. I do consult frequently over the telephone with other depositories.
-It depends on the extent to which these visits would be made. Travel restrictions with state government and personnel time costly. On the other hand, something should perhaps be returned for the privilege for having documents free - and to such an extent.
-Lack of staff and funds for this purpose.
-Most visits have been at my own expense.
-Takes time and money.
-Our university will not financially support this.
-No time and/or money. Don't agree.
-Library funds for travel are not sufficient for this requirement.
-Our present staffing level is barely adequate to keep up with heavy workload of running a very large separate documents collection.

APPENDIX O - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 35

35. If financial support is furnished by the federal government, do you favor transfer of responsibility for inspection of depository libraries from the Superintendent of Documents to regional depositories to insure compliance with the law? ___yes ___ no. Comment:

-This is too big an undertaking for a Regional Library.
-As worded this sounds too much like a policing action. Emphasis, staff, time, and funds, which will probably always be limited would be better concentrated on consultant and advisory functions, conducting workshops, preparing training materials, etc. If the regional depositories are expected to inspect and evaluate (though I hope not) then at least two conditions should be met:
  (1) Approval of depository applications by the State Library should be required to insure that the applicant can handle depository status.
  (2) Objective standards should be set nationally.
-It is much more feasible geographically, although administratively it might cause potential conflicts of interest between two libraries.
-Added staff necessary.
-Provided inspectors are to report non-compliance to the Superintendent of Documents, and not have any enforcement responsibilities themselves.
-Only if uniform standards, and training of regionals.
-Yes, if agreeable with employer.
-GPO should have field coordinators. I'm a librarian, not an inspector.
-We could get just as much "compliance" as GPO, but GPO should maintain its statistics problem.
-I am unalterably opposed to the idea. We follow the law for regional depository libraries and go beyond it in giving help to libraries that require it. Librarians at other libraries in the state are also doing their duty and giving good service on U.S. government documents. There is no need for an "inspecton" plan by regional depositories.
-Allow for a more meaningful relationship. Need revised depository standards.
-I have no desire to be a Federal Inspector. Don't think I should have to be.
-Assistance, not inspection!
-Job is presently overwhelming for the Superintendent of Documents. This would also insure better communication between regionals and other depositories.
-Due to the current financial crisis in higher education, it is very difficult to find the time or the staff to go out visiting depositories, which are spread over a large area in the state. If it is required I think the federal government is obligated to back up the requirement with funds. The regional depository would, however, have a better idea of what is needed in the area, and know how best the depository is serving local needs.

APPENDIX P - COMMENTS ON QUESTION 42

42. What other reference asistance do you feel regional libraries should be expected to furnish in accordance with the law?

-Whatever provides maximum utilization of the documents resources.
-Answer difficult questions not within resources of specific library.
-Photocopy, reproduction services.
-I think the regional library should provide any service with federal documents that might be needed by the various depositories in the region.
-Interlibrary loan, title searches for patrons and photo-copying.
-Any they are called upon, provided the local library has exhausted its resources.
-We have done a union list of items held by depository libraries in the state so we can refer people to other libraries with requests for material that is in use at the time of the request. We believe in doing as much as is humanly possible. We like our resources to be used, and our services as well. We encourage libraries, other depositories, and individuals to make use of us.
-If the regional depository does not have a specific document, it should be able to provide verification so that a patron can request it from other sources.
-We also offer telephone reference service to any client or library calling in for this service.
-Provide maximum service to all.
-Telephone reference service.
-The same reference service given from the regular collection; i.e. any assistance within the scope of the collection and availability of staff to serve the local needs.
-We encourage selective depositories to visit our regional.
-We lend outside of the state because other depositories do not have as large a collection as we have.
-Help with finding information not held by a selective depository.